Our monsters, Ourselves

An analysis of the modern monster in
The Fall and *Hannibal*

By

Hanne Mørch Jacobsen

Master in Literary Studies 2016

University of
Stavanger

Universitetet
i Stavanger

FACULTY OF ARTS AND EDUCATION

MASTER'S THESIS

Programme of study: MLIMAS – Master in Literacy Studies	Spring semester, 2016 Open
Author: Hanne Mørch Jacobsen	………………………………………… (Author's signature)

Supervisor: Janne Stigen Drangsholt

Thesis title:

Our monsters, Ourselves – An analysis of the modern monster in *The Fall* and *Hannibal*

| Keywords:

Moral monster
Monster theory
Fairy tale theory
Gender roles
Otherness | No. of pages: 91
+ appendices/other: 12

Stavanger, May 12, 2016 |

Abstract

The monster has been a popular figure in Western society for centuries, as a notion that has both fascinated and frightened its members. The aim of this thesis is to investigate the modern, moral monster that exists within contemporary Western society, and how this is presented in two modern texts. The chosen texts for the analysis in the thesis are the TV-series *The Fall* and *Hannibal,* which both deals with the notion of the moral monster through the figure of the serial killer.

The thesis sets to investigate how we use the literary presentations of the moral monster in order to create structure and maintain boundaries in society. In order to do so, monster theory, fairy tale theory, social theory and gender theory is applied. The investigation presented in this thesis is mainly grounded in the works of Jack Zipes, Jeffrey Jerome Cohen and Marina Warner. It will also include the work of theorists such as Michel Foucault and Kelly Hurley, in order to examine the notion of the moral monster thoroughly.

Throughout time, the monster has been used as a symbol of warning in fairy tales and cautionary tales. One of the most popular cautionary tales in Western culture is the story of "Little Red Riding Hood", which follows the narrative structure of fairy tales and presents a damsel in distress and a big, bad wolf who threatens her safety. This is used as a framework throughout this thesis, which sets to analyse how the two texts *The Fall* and *Hannibal* can also function as a modified form of cautionary tale. It also examines whether the serial killers in the TV-series can be seen as a modern kind of 'wolf', who lurks in the contemporary society, and how the two texts address the challenges of the gender roles that exist within modern culture.

Another aspect this thesis addresses is the notion of 'otherness' and how this is presented and defined in contemporary society. Because of its abnormal features, the monster can be seen as the absolute 'other', and helps us creating a sense of 'self' by presenting a binary opposite to this. Since the monster is created as a result of the anxieties that exist within a culture, it can say something about the aspects one wishes to get rid of and distance oneself from. As a result, the moral monster can also say something about the contemporary Western society, and those who live within it.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor Janne Stigen Drangsholt. If it had not been for all her 'thumbs up', great ideas and constructive guidance, I would have been utterly lost when writing this thesis. I also need to thank 'Lunsj(snack)klubben' for all the great food and good laughs (and for sharing my terrible sense of humour). Thanks to the radio show 'Raae og Osnes', which has made me seem like a complete idiot in the library due to spontaneous bursts of laughter. To Marit and Øystein, thank you for feeding me with tacos every Friday night! And last, but not least, a huge thanks to Sondre for helping me with the quotes from the series, for encouraging me and giving me moral support on bad days, and for always providing awful jokes. You are the best.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

> We live in a time of monsters.
>
> (Cohen 1996:xii)

> Monsters are our children. They can be pushed to the farthest margins of geography and discourse, hidden away at the edges of the world and in the forbidden recesses of our mind, but they always return.
>
> (Cohen 1996:20)

This thesis is a study of the two contemporary texts *The Fall* and *Hannibal,* which are seen to represent the monsters of our time. In this thesis I will focus on what will be referred to as a *moral* monster. This is a figure who performs monstrous, abnormal actions, and thereby transgresses the rules and borders of society and humanity. This kind of monster cannot be detected visually, but has to be revealed by its monstrous actions. A typical moral monster that hides among us is the serial killer, and this is the main character in the two texts that will be analysed in this thesis.

The monster challenges us to discuss and reconsider our society's rules and values, as well as the actions that characterise 'normality'. In his text *Monster Culture – Seven Theses* (1996), Jeffrey Jerome Cohen suggests that the monster is not only a threat towards individual members of society, but also the structures within society upon which we build our identity as human beings (Cohen 1996:12).

According to Cohen, we get the monsters we deserve. The monster always seems to appear at a time of crisis, and has an 'ontological liminality' that threatens the rules of society (Cohen 1996:6). The *Oxford English Dictionaries*[1] defines the term *ontological* as 'referring to the branch of metaphysics dealing with the nature of being', and explain how *liminality*, or the *liminal* refers to something that is 'occupying a position at, or on both sides of, a boundary or threshold' (Oxford English Dictionaries online, 2016). Cohen claims that because the monster is a being that is ontologically liminal, it can question binary thinking and introduce a crisis (Cohen 1996:6). This shows us that the monster both appears in a moment of crisis and

---

[1] This will henceforth be referred to as the OED

creates a crisis within us, since it is placed at the edge of what we can know. It is a figure that challenges us to discuss and reconsider our own rules as well as society itself. Since the monster is a product of its time, monster narratives can say something about our society and ourselves. As a result of this the monster has frequently been, and still is, presented in literature in Western society.

Cohen (1996) argues that the monster is 'an embodiment of a certain cultural moment – of a time, a feeling and a place' and that the monster's body 'incorporates fear, desire, anxiety and fantasy' in a certain culture (Cohen, 1996:vii, 3-4). There is a complex relation between social, cultural, and literary-historical factors that create and shape the monster. This means that the monster is constantly changing according to the changes within society and its norms and ideology (Cohen 1996:5-6).

Another important feature of the monster is that it can function as a scapegoat. Cohen claims that the unwanted aspects of a culture can be transferred to the monster, before being 'ritually destroyed in course of some official narrative' (Cohen 1996:18). By exterminating it we can free ourselves from unwanted thoughts and ideas, and it can therefor function as a sort of 'exorcism'. If these narratives are retold and promoted they can even operate as catechisms (Cohen 1996:18). There appears to be a short boundary between the scapegoat and the monster, and this means that the monster can be seen as the absolute other. When it has shown its true self, it needs to be banished. The scapegoat is always different, or 'other' in some way, and because of this, the moral monster can also be seen as an embodiment of 'otherness'. It is a notion that is both challenging while at the same time helps us create structure and boundaries.

Otherness is always created, and a culture can be read and analysed through the 'other' monsters it creates. Therefore, it can also say something about what society accepts and does not accept in regards to its members' behaviour. Cohen notes that '[m]onsters are never created *ex nihilo'* and that they are a combination of elements that are considered deviant and 'other' (Cohen 1996:12). As an other, the moral monster also exemplifies the binary opposite of 'self', both the individual 'self' and the 'self' that is linked to our function in society, and how challenging features of this might be changed and developed.

The two analysis chapters in this thesis aim to investigate how the modern, male monster is used as a tool to exemplify what constitutes 'otherness' in contemporary society and how the moral monster challenges this notion in *The Fall* and *Hannibal*. The chosen texts in this thesis are examples of how we can address various problems in society, as they both deal with serial killers, but in different ways. Whereas *The Fall* can be seen as a contemporary

cautionary tale, *Hannibal* functions as a critique of society. They carry a cultural significance as they both represent and mirror society, albeit with different purposes. Richard Kearney (2013) supports the belief that monsters mirror society and the people who live in it when he states: 'in a sense we may say that monsters are our *others* par excellence. Without them we know not what we are. Without them we are not what we know'[2] (Kearney, cited in Wright 2013:17).

1.1 Main aims and limitations

This thesis will present a literary analysis in order to investigate what the two texts can say about our own time and society. If Cohen is correct when he claims that monsters appear in a time of crisis and are warnings, they must surely also say something about our time, our society, and ourselves. To investigate this I will focus on the literary representation of the serial killer, or moral monster, rather than an analysis of an actual being. Traditionally, the word monster means 'warning', and this thesis set to examine what the monster in these literary narratives might be a warning of. I will read *The Fall* and *Hannibal* as texts, even though they are television series, as they follow the same narrative structure as literary texts, by having characters, dialogue and a setting. This is why it will be useful to employ a literary analysis when reading them. Recently, TV-series have become even more similar to traditional literary narratives, as broadcasting networks such as HBO, Netflix and BBC have emphasised the importance of making them more complex narratives. I believe this increased complexity is why TV-series such as *The Fall* and *Hannibal* are worthwhile to look at and investigate.

The second chapter in this thesis comprises a literary review, where the most relevant definitions and theories that can be linked to the analysis of the moral monster in the two texts will be presented. To create a general platform for the analysis of the TV-series I will mainly apply fairy tale theory, monster theory and gender theory. It will furthermore provide a more thorough description of the moral monster, and investigate how we define otherness. Additionally, it will look into the functions of myths, fairy tales and cautionary tales for our understanding of ourselves as a society and as human beings. Relevant theory from the fields

---

[2] Author's emphasis

of study mentioned above will be referred to throughout the thesis, in order to ground the analysis of the texts and provide a frame in which the texts' monsters will be analysed.

In the third chapter I will address and analyse *The Fall*. The main goal of this chapter is to investigate whether this narrative can function as a contemporary cautionary tale. As a result, the analysis sheds light on the function of gender roles and stereotypes in modern times, and how these can be linked to those of a traditional patriarchy. Throughout the analysis, parallels will be drawn to Charles Perrault's version of "Little Red Riding Hood", in order to shed further light on the function of cautionary tales. *The Fall* presents a range of characters that both confirm and challenge gender roles and rules of society, and the function of these will be analysed in the chapter. Finally, the chapter seeks to investigate how the traditional gender roles might be problematic in modern times, and how the modern cautionary tales present the serial killer as a warning of the contemporary, urban 'wolf'.

The TV-series *Hannibal* will be the focus of the fourth chapter of this thesis. The main purpose of this part is to investigate whether the series can be seen as a critique of society, through the notion of the serial killer. The moral monster in this series is cannibalistic, and the chapter addresses how he is capable of making others complicit in his monstrous acts. This is not only related to the other characters in *Hannibal*, but also us as viewers. In order to thoroughly investigate how the cannibalistic serial killer is able to do this, lines will be drawn to the Byronic hero and the character of the vampire. Another goal of the analysis is to study how this character can function as a socio-economical critique of the Western society and its foundation in capitalism. It raises questions about hypocrisy and whether consumerism can be seen as a form of cannibalism. Finally, the chapter addresses the problems of categorisation, and how it is difficult to determine who are merely 'different' and who are monstrous 'others'.

Due to limitations in the scope of the thesis, I have chosen to focus on the first two seasons of each TV-series. In regards to the characters in each series, I have chosen to mainly focus the analysis on the main characters. That is, Paul Spector and Stella Gibson in *The Fall*, and Hannibal Lecter and Will Graham in *Hannibal*. Other characters will also be mentioned, but rather as tools to assist in the analysis of the main characters.

Literature, such as those genres mentioned above, provides a sphere where one can express ideas and address difficult notions that cannot be addressed elsewhere. Narratives employ divisions that function to uphold society, as they create structure and boundaries. They help us to construct ideas, but also to deconstruct them, since they challenge existing structures and categories. This process of construction and deconstruction can help society to

evolve and rethink old ideas. The moral monster can function as a tool in order to do this, as it is able to challenge the established ideas.

Marina Warner claims that for the last century, the serial killer has 'dominated contemporary folklore' (Warner 2010:23). This type of monster, usually male, is a monster of reality that is reflected and portrayed in contemporary cautionary tales and narratives. The serial killer can perhaps be seen as a modern kind of wolf that lurks in a contemporary, urban forest in order to prey on modern Red Riding Hoods.

Mischa Kavka (2002) argues that the paranoia that was once created by 'shadows or ghostly figures becomes the perfectly rational fear of a lunatic killer on the loose' (Kavka 2002:226-227). This suggests that the monsters who were formerly placed in the margins of the world, such as the serial killer, have become more 'real', and thereby more threatening. There are a range of different types of crisis within modern society, for instance related to economy and safety, and this thesis seeks to investigate how the serial killer, or moral monster, can be seen as a comment on these. It will try to unveil another important question in regards to monster narratives: can the narratives themselves, through their function as a warning, be seen as monsters too?

Chapter 2: Literary review

Popular culture teems with monsters
(Warner, 2010:17)

2.1 Introduction

Literary narratives play an important role in Western society to create structure and boundaries, as well as to warn about the dangers that exist within it. This chapter will provide an introduction to the theory that is the foundation of my analysis of the TV-series *The Fall* and *Hannibal*. It will provide a general discussion about the underlying aspects that have secured the modern monster a place in contemporary Western society. The chapter will also look into the concept of 'otherness' and how literature, such as myths and fairy tales, can be used as a tool in order to discuss and explore this. It seeks to investigate how 'otherness' creates a binary opposition to the concept of 'self', and how it can help us construct this. The discussion of otherness will also address the character of the serial killer, which is popular in contemporary narratives. The literary review will then go on to present the TV-series this thesis is set to analyse, *The Fall* and *Hannibal*, and the moral monsters these contain.

We have seen that the moral monster is a character that has been created within a society in order to express the anxieties of its members, as well as to define the distinction between normality and otherness. Cohen (1996) supports the argument that the monster represents abominations against society, when he argues that it 'threatens to destroy not just individual members of society, but the very cultural apparatus through which individuality is constituted and allowed' (Cohen 1996:12). When he explains how the monster is an 'incorporation of the Outside, the Beyond – of all those loci that are rhetorically placed as distant and distinct but originate Within', he indicates that the monster is both familiar and strange. This means that it embodies traits that are also present in 'normal' individuals, even though the latter wishes to distance themselves from these.

This chapter will provide a presentation of the theories this thesis are grounded on. To do this, the chapter will mainly use texts from Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, Michel Foucault, Marina Warner and Jack Zipes. It will also examine what the term 'moral monster' includes more thoroughly, and how this can help us define otherness. The literary review will also look into myths and fairy tales, and examine how these have been used to warn us about the dangers that exist within society.

According to the OED, a *monster* is either 'a large, ugly, and frightening imaginary creature', or 'an inhumanely cruel or wicked person'. These definitions signal some of the complexity of the monster – how it both belongs to the fictional and the real world and how it is both a 'creature' and a 'person'. This complexity also makes the monster a fascinating creature, however, provoking both interest and terror. The first part of this chapter will examine the literary moral monster and what this notion embodies, as this thesis will address the concept through its representation in literature, rather than a realistic, social analysis of real monsters. The analysis of the moral monster in the chosen texts will, in other words, be grounded in narrative and the stories we tell.

The chapter will use fairy tale theory in order to ground the analysis. As mentioned, however, Michel Foucault's book *Abnormal* (1975) will also be used as to investigate the rules of society, which the moral monster both challenges and helps construct. An examination of the normative and judicial laws of Western society is important, as these set the boundaries for society and helps us categorise who is allowed to stay within, and who is categorised as 'other'. Modern Western society is built upon a social pact that everyone needs to follow in order to fully be members of said society. This consists of two kinds of rules: judicial laws, which are official and written down, and normative rules, which are implicit rules all members are supposed to follow. If they do not conform to these, they risk being left out of social interactions and will not be accepted by other members, and are consequently categorised as 'abnormal' or 'abhuman'.

The moral monster is a despot who breeches the laws of society. This makes it a transgressive character that exemplifies otherness and the abnormal, something that is opposed to the conforming members of society. The second part of this chapter will therefore examine the concept of 'otherness' and what this embodies. Cohen (1996) is one of the authors whose works will be used throughout the thesis, and he argues that 'otherness' is always created and that the monster embodies this (Cohen 1996:4). In the OED the term *otherness* is defined as 'the quality of fact of being different', while the term 'other' is defined as an 'alternative of two' (Oxford English Dictionaries online, 2016). An individual that is considered 'other' and does not conform to the rules, stands a binary opposite to a 'normal' individual. As a result, s/he is situated outside the social pact and can therefore be categorised as different from the rest of society.

Since the moral monster is an 'other', a frightening, transgressive notion we want to keep it at safe distance from ourselves, and one way of doing this is through the use of literary narratives. Another function narratives can have is to help us understand problematic and

challenging notions, such as the moral monster. Two of literary branches that can be used for such a purpose are myths and fairy tales. These are narratives that create structure and boundaries, and therefore they function particularly well when dealing with transgressive figures such as the moral monster.

Myths and fairy tales are genres of literature that present us with different codes of a culture and convey its values and ideas. Marina Warner argues that one of the reasons they can do so is because they are narratives that are well known in the culture, and are thereby a part of the collective identity (Warner 2010:14). The works of Jack Zipes will also be useful to examine how the fairy tale can function as a cautionary tale. The main purpose of this kind of narrative is to warn about the dangers that exist within society. Zipes (2006) claims that the fairy tales that function as warnings are valuable in the process of socialising the members of society, and that the protagonist of such narratives can help us understand the dominant norms in a culture (Zipes 2006:66-69). Because of this, Zipes' texts are valuable in order to determine why fairy tales and cautionary tales have had, and still have, such an important place in society.

One of the most influential cautionary tales in Western society is the story "Little Red Riding Hood", and this will be discussed and used as an example in relation to the function of cautionary tales. One of the reasons why this is particularly useful in regards to the analysis in this thesis is because it sheds light on the problematic aspects of gender roles in Western society. Additionally, the cautionary tales present a wolf, or villain, that is not easy to recognise as monstrous, similar to the ones in *The Fall* and *Hannibal*. This kind of narrative can also function as a critique of society since it addresses stereotypes, as well as presents warnings of the moral monsters that exist within Western society. The version of "Little Red Riding Hood" that will be used in this thesis is the one from 1697, written by Charles Perrault. The reason why this is particularly useful is because it contains a prologue called the 'moral', which emphasises how young, naïve girls are easy targets for the wolf if they are too curious and do not follow the rules set by society (Perrault, cited in Zipes 1993:91-93).

Bruno Bettelheim (1967) presents a Freudian reading of the tale, where he points to how Little Red Riding Hood becomes a victim because she is too curious, and is consequently tricked by the seductive wolf. He argues that the moral of the story can be seen as a sign of how the patriarchal society views women, and how they are not able to control their sexuality. They are thereby in need of protection, which is provided by the male hero or hunter (Bettelheim 1967:169-173, 205). This shows how cautionary tales include a gender aspect, where men and women are divided into categories. The stereotypes presented by cautionary

tales state that women are innocent or naïve victims, whereas men are either huntsmen or wolves. The modern versions of such cautionary tales often come in the form of detective stories, where the male detective is supposed to protect the female victim from the male villain. The narrative structure of detective stories is also present in the two series this thesis sets to analyse, and this is especially the case in *The Fall*.

Narratives such as "Little Red Riding Hood" could suggest that there is an inherent fear of men in Western society, and Warner agues that these are capable of performing monstrous actions when young females leave the safe sphere of the home (Warner 2010:23). One of the male characters who is feared within Western society today, is the serial killer. A core aspect of the serial killer, which makes him a particularly frightening notion, is that he is able to hide his abnormality. There are, in other words, no visible signs that suggest that he is dangerous. This feature is perhaps why he has been a popular figure in folklore for hundreds of years, and why he is a useful figure to study.

As we have seen, the serial killer is a character in who disturbs the balance of society and transgresses its laws. All of the aspects mentioned above in relation to the moral monster, that is, transgressions of the law, otherness, gender stereotypes, and the function of myths and fairy tales, are present and problematized in *The Fall* and *Hannibal*. The series will therefore be advantageous to analyse, in terms of how they present and address these issues, as well as the notion of the moral monster. The concepts mentioned above, will be valuable as to create a general platform in order to analyse the moral, male monster of contemporary Western society, the serial killer, which is found in the TV-series *The Fall* and *Hannibal*.

2.2 The moral monster

The monster is a figure that has been present in popular stories throughout time. As mentioned, this thesis will focus on the literary moral monster, rather than real monsters who live within society. The analysis of the moral monsters in the chosen text will evolve around the stories we tell about monster, and what these represent and can tell us about contemporary Western society. In order to do so, we first need to know what the concept of the moral monster embodies.

'The monster is transgressive', Cohen (1996) states. It is a notion that refuses to be categorised, but is linked to 'forbidden practices' that are frowned upon by society. One of the main goals of linking the moral monster to behaviour and ideas that are not accepted is to

teach the members of a society what is considered 'normal' behaviour and what is not. Cohen argues that the monster's transgressive traits are used in order to 'normalize and enforce' those values that are seen as proper within a culture (Cohen 1996:16). The reason why the moral monster is especially useful as to convey ideas and values is because its monstrousness is a result of its actions, rather than its physical appearance.

As we have seen, the moral monster is considered transgressive because it does not conform to the rules and norms set by society. A result of this is that society categorises it as deviant and abnormal, but also 'abhuman'. Kelly Hurley explains the 'abhuman subject' in the book *The Gothic Body* (1996). She describes it as 'not-quite-human', and argues that it always is 'in danger of becoming not-itself, becoming other'. The abhuman body is a liminal one, she claims, and is often perceived as 'abominable' (Hurley 1996:3-4, 9). She further explains this in the chapter "British Gothic fiction, 1885-1930" in the book *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*. Here, she points out how the liminal body of the abhuman does not have 'a fully human existence', but is rather balancing on binary oppositions such as 'human/beast, male/female, or civilized/primitive'. As a result of this, it is able to 'confound[s] one's ability to make sense of the world' (Hurley 2002:190).

The abhuman moral monster is, through its liminality, forcing us to question the ideas and values upon which Western society is built. What is particularly fascinating about the abhuman moral monster is its ability to take human form, but still be monstrous. This ability to appear like a human being, and still be liminal, makes it a threat towards the 'integrity of human identity' (Hurley 2002:190). The notion of the abhuman can also raise the question 'what is a human being?'. If the abhuman subject can look like a human being, but be monstrous, it suddenly blurs our definitions and categories in regards to this question. It can also function to represent the aspects that are repressed by a culture and considered 'other', and this makes it an intriguing notion to study, as it can tell us something about society and the problematic aspects of the ideas and values it promotes (Hurley 2002:197-198).

'Abhumanness is a repulsively fascinating spectacle' that returns frequently in literature, Hurley states (2002:190). This combination of features makes the abhuman alluring, in the way that it is both frightening and attractive. With its human-like traits and monstrous behaviour, the abnormal subject can be seen as what Sigmund Freud described as 'the uncanny'. He explains how the uncanny is 'in reality nothing new or alien, but something which is familiar and old-established in the mind and which has become alienated from it only though the process of repression' (Freud 1955:339-376). This suggests that the abhuman moral monster represent something that has been repressed by society, which threatens to

resurface through the body and actions of the moral monster. The ability to embody repressed fears while at the same time have familiar traits makes the abhuman monster especially intimidating. It means that it is capable of hiding its monstrousness, while it at the same time is making us fascinated and attracted to it.

As we have seen, the monster is a notion that continues to haunt our imagination, and make us paranoid. Given this, the monster stories in this thesis will be investigated as stories about paranoia. In monster narratives the boundaries between self and other are blurred, as we project the self to the world outside. This is then read as hostile, as the other 'becomes a version of the self returned, with interests, in the form of hostility'. This suggests that parts of the culture that has been expelled, or abjected, may return to haunt it (Kavka 2002:210).

TV-series such as *The Fall* and *Hannibal* can show us how paranoia is presented in contemporary society, and how it is problematic to detect the 'invisible', abhuman moral monster. They can also show us how the expelled notions of society still haunt us, and how these conceal themselves in modern times. The problem of detecting otherness hidden behind familiar traits is one of the key aspects of myths and fairy tales, which will be used as a framework in this thesis. These are narratives where one can learn about, and be entertained by, the horrific creatures of the world through fictional stories. Monster narratives and fairy tales like "Little Red Riding Hood" can produce enough paranoia for us to be aware of the dangers of the forest, and thereby they function well as a cautionary tales. We can say that the paranoia that was once created by ghosts is now presented by the urban, rational killer on the loose, the serial killer, and that this is still portrayed in various cautionary narratives today, for instance in TV-series such as *The Fall* and *Hannibal*.

2.3 What is a myth?

In order to decide what otherness is, we need to look at ourselves; who we are and what we want. One way of doing this is through the use of myths, which are narratives that enable us to perceive ourselves from a distance. They also impose structure and order upon us through made up stories, Warner states (Warner 2010:19). The word 'myth' was coined in Greek language, and means 'a form of speech', and is always spoken for a purpose (Warner 2010:19). In the chapter "Modernist Gothic" in *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Gothic*, John Paul Riquelme (2014) argues that one of the benefits of the myth is the fact that it is 'a narrative that everyone in the culture knows, with varying degrees of clarity and detail,

even without having read *the* text' (Riquelme 2014:32). They are stories we learn from childhood and are well known amongst every member of society, and thereby become a part of the collective identity.

According to Ronald Barthes 'there is no fixity in mythical concepts – they can come into being, alter, disintegrate, disappear completely'. He also states that 'myth is not defined by the object of its message, but by the way in which it utters its message' (Barthes, cited in Wright 2013:25). This means that it is not the mythical figure itself, but rather the message it presents, or the idea it embodies, that is the most important aspect of the myth.

Marina Warner (2010) supports this view, as she states that 'myths offer a lens which can be used to see human identity in its social and cultural context' (Warner 2010:14). As mentioned, we need a binary opposite in order to create a feeling of 'self', and also to create the normative and juridical borders of society. Myths can therefore be used as a tool in order to convey values and ideas society wishes its members to learn and follow. Even though some of the popular myths are old, the messages they convey are adapted in a way that suits the contemporary society, and will continue to do so (Warner 2010:14).

Another tool that can be used in narratives in order to convey the values of a given society is the monster. Just as the myth, the monster's purpose is to show us something. The word 'monster' originates from the Latin word 'monstrum', which also means 'that which warns', or 'that which reveals'. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (1996) argues that the monster 'signifies something other than itself' from the cultural moment in which it was created. It embodies the anxieties, desires and fears of society, and gives them life in a way that makes Cohen argue that the body of the monster is 'pure culture' (Cohen 1996:4). The monster is therefore an important tool for any society in order to convey which values and behaviour are considered appropriate, and which are not.

2.3.1 Myths as cautionary tales

One genre of the myth that has got an important role in Western society is the fairy tale, especially the cautionary tale, which is a narrative that intends to show or warn us of the dangers that exist within society. Narratives such as myths and cautionary tales are mostly told or read to children, and partly function as a tool in order to socialise them and make them part of the culture in which they grow up. Jack Zipes (2012) describes culture as 'a historical process of human objectification', and claims that the young members are taught 'the norms

12

and values that legitimize the socio-political systems… that guarantee some sort of continuity in society' in order to integrate them in the culture (Zipes 2012:66).

Tales such as the myth are important in this process of socialisation, as they help the reader understand and reflect on the boundaries of society, as well as on his/her own identity. In tales, the norms are presented through the behaviour of the protagonist. As s/he manages to solve problems by following the rules, the child learns that conflicts can be resolved if one follows the code set by society (Zipes 2012:66-69). If the main character breaks the normative rules, however, there will be consequences, and this is especially the case for women.

Western culture is founded on patriarchy, with the white, heterosexual male as the ruling character both in the home and in society as a whole. Women have traditionally had a restricted place in the social and cultural sphere, and cautionary tales have perhaps been used as a tool in order to secure and justify the patriarchal structure. Zipes (2006) argues that the classical fairy tales 'tend to be overtly patriarchal and politically conservative in structure and theme and reflect the dominant interests of social groups', such as males (Zipes 2006:2). Canonical tales have, however, not only been made to 'preserve male domination'. Since they have been replicated they also function to 'question them, explore them, change them, and reutilize them', Zipes claims (Zipes 2006:xii). Thereby, one could perhaps use fairy tales to challenge and explore existing dominant groups, as well as the categorisation of individuals within society.

There are some figures that have acquired a more significant role in our culture, such as the warrior, the sex criminal and the serial killer, who is frequently a sexual offender as well. The serial killer makes an interesting character because of his central role in contemporary folklore for the last hundred years (Warner 2010:23). There are no visible signs that can reveal his abnormality – his face is the same as ours, even the same as the hero's – and this makes him both a terrifying and a fascinating creature. Through myths women learn that this 'invisible' threat is always present, that one should not go into the forest alone or talk to strangers. In short, that the threat of men is always present.

One of the most famous myths, or fairy tales, in Western society is "Little Red Riding Hood", which is a classical example of a cautionary tale, a story made to issue warning. It describes the view Western society has towards women, as easy targets who need to be careful. If they are not careful, they will be considered responsible for their own misfortunes. Zipes suggests that the key idea of "Little Red Riding Hood" is that 'women are responsible for their own rape', and emphasises how the only person who might be able to save them from themselves and their 'lustful desires' is 'a strong male figure' (Zipes 2006:37).

The story of "Little Red Riding Hood" evolves around a little girl who is sent out by her mother to deliver food to her sick grandmother. As she walks through the forest, she encounters the big, bad wolf, which she talks to and tells where she is going. The wolf gets there first, eats the grandmother, before he tricks and eats Little Red Riding Hood too. The famous tale ends with the wolf being killed by a brave huntsman, who saves both Little Red Riding Hood and her grandmother. Several authors, such as the Brothers Grimm, have retold the tale, but it is the 1697 version by Charles Perrault that is most relevant when looking at myths as cautionary tales. This is because Perrault's version includes a clear 'moral' in the end that describes how 'especially young girls' should not talk to strangers, and that if they do, it will come as no surprise if they get eaten by a wolf' (Perrault 1697, cited in Zipes 1993:91-93).

"Little Red Riding Hood" is a narrative that has been used throughout the last centuries to provide rules for young girls and women on how to behave. It has functioned to provide us with stereotypes that say that young girls are easy targets for moral monsters, and need to be aware of the dangers that lurk within society. It also includes the stereotype that claims that men are either hunters or wolves, that is, either good citizens and protectors or monsters. The gender roles in narratives like "Little Red Riding Hood" give clear guidelines to what the patriarchal Western society expects men and women to accept. They also explain what kinds of men young girls should be prepared to meet, and what behaviour they need to exercise in order to stay safe. This is for instance the case of Charles Perrault's version of "Little Red Riding Hood", in which there is a 'moral' part at the end that states that young girls need to be aware of all the seductive wolves that lurks within society.

The story of the innocent, young girl in the woods who becomes a victim of the seductive wolf is useful to apply in order to analyse *The Fall* and *Hannibal*. As mentioned, it presents ideas and values that have been present in Western society for hundreds of years. 'Invisible' threats, and the function of gender roles and stereotypes are themes that are addressed and described in the fairy tale, and the moral monster the two contemporary texts can comment on and challenge these. The fairy tale has a narrative style that also is present in the modern narratives, for instance through the characters who are categorised as victims, hunters, or wolves. Since the fairy tale "Little Red Riding Hood" is a well-known story in Western culture, it is a particularly useful device when trying to ground the analysis of this thesis.

Bruno Bettelheim (1967) discusses how Little Red Riding Hood is faced with the 'quandary of standing between reality principle and pleasure principle', the choice between

doing what one wants to do and what one ought to do. Even though her mother warned the Little Red Riding Hood about leaving the path, the wolf was able to persuade her to do it. He argues that the wolf is seductive, and links the moral of the story to how 'untroubled pubertal' girls might be seduced by men when they are to leave the safety sphere of the home (Bettelheim 1967:169-171). Through her encounter with the wolf, Little Red Riding Hood transforms from a 'naïve, attractive young girl' to 'a fallen woman', and this is her own fault as she talks with a stranger in the forest, Bettelheim claims (Bettelheim 1967:169).

It is implied that it is her 'budding sexuality', mixed with curiosity and immatureness that leads Little Red Riding Hood into trouble (Bettelheim 1967:173). This exemplifies how the patriarchal society views the sexuality of women; it is present, but women do not know how to deal with it, and therefore they are in need of protection. The solution is either that a male hero provides this protection, or that the young girls could, through cautionary tales, be taught how to avoid it by following the strict normative rules. These are there to protect them from the dangers they will encounter if they express their sexuality, or simply walk alone in the forest.

Just as in many of the old myths and fairy tales, modern films and books often evolve around the figure of the damsel in distress. The sexual punishment of women who are too 'free', and the 'deep oppositeness of the female sex' are important themes in modern myths and narratives as well (Warner 2010:25). Warner (2010) argues that the formula used is very old and simple, but, as society has changed and the girls have become tougher, so have the creatures they are up against (Warner 2010:25). This implies that the monster has become more dangerous, and that young women in modern times need to be even more careful. This is for instance exemplified in *The Fall*. In this series, one of the characters believes she became a victim of the serial killers abnormal sexual actions because she was not careful enough, as she engaged in a sexual relationship with a man she did not know very well. This means that because the male serial killer in modern times is 'invisible', women need to be even more attentive.

If the monster becomes more dangerous, the protection of women needs to reflect this. As society appears to believe women are not fully capable of protecting themselves, their protection needs to be provided by a male character, or hero. Warner (2010) argues that there has been an emphasis on warrior strength 'grounded in the different social circumstances of a military or pastoral, archaic society'. The result of this has been that the mythical hero has continued to slay monsters and control women, in order to secure his masculinity and to be able to define himself as a man. However, todays 'warrior fantasies' are only able to 'offer a

quick compensatory power, but pass on no survival skills', Warner states (Warner 2010:24). In *Hannibal* the head of Behavioural Science at the FBI, Jack Crawford, exemplifies this idea. He is supposed to function as one of the male heroes in the series whose job it is to 'slay monsters', but fails to recognise the moral monster and serial killer right in front of him. Even though his intentions are good, his actions prove to provide no real security for the victims of the moral monster.

In modern literature, the male hero often comes in the shape of a detective, a representative of the law whose main mission is to secure that the rules of society are followed. The detective is a character who is supposed to restore structure after the villain of the story has disturbed this, and could perhaps be compared to the huntsman of classical fairy tales, who is the only person who might save the young girls from their misfortunes. By securing that the laws of society are followed, the detective is supposed to restore balance and save the damsel in distress from all the horrors and monsters she might encounter. This is also the case in both *The Fall* and *Hannibal,* where the main characters Stella Gibson and Will Graham work as detectives. Their job is to hunt down and arrest moral monsters, or serial killers. Through their line of work they protect vulnerable members of society by removing the threat against them, while at the same time restoring balance in society.

Even though the heroes of such stories are most often men, the fear of men has nevertheless grown in the modern Western culture. A reason to this is because the 'wolves' of modern literature are most frequently male, as well. When young women leave the safe sphere of the home, it is mostly men who pose a threat towards their safety, such as in "Little Red Riding Hood". Although the male heroes play an important role in myths, they sometimes come too late and are not able to protect and save the young woman. The increased fear of men is a result of the modern belief that the young male's character is defined by aggression, such as sexual violence (Warner 2010:23). As narratives like "Little Red Riding Hood" indicates, every intruder might be a threat and this threat is most likely to come in the shape of a man. The belief is, in other words, that the male monster is highly present within today's society, and that every male will either be a hero or a rapist.

This belief appears to be present in contemporary narratives as well. Both of the serial killers in *The Fall* and *Hannibal* are male, and this supports the notion that there is an increasing fear of men in modern times. In *The Fall,* all the victims except from one are females, which further strengthens the idea that the moral, male monster mainly targets women. The fact that all the detectives in *Hannibal* are male also supports the belief that men are either heroes or villains. The strict categorisation in Western society is also present in this

series as the characters feel the need to define Will Graham as 'good' or 'bad', hero or 'wolf', and do not accept him as merely 'different'.

Gender roles clearly play an important role in myths, where men are either categorised as heroes or villains, while women are seen as weak and in need of protection. Even though women are seen as victims in general, not all of them are as attractive. Most of the women who are mistreated in the myths are young women, who, in Bettelheim's words, have a 'budding sexuality'. The men prey on girls and young women, not the old widows or mothers who stay at home. This poses an extra threat, as the young women are those who are supposed to carry life, and make sure the next generation is safe. If these are threatened, so is the foundation of the entire society. However, if the girls are not careful in their actions, the heroes might not be able to save them, and they could risk ending up as victims of the male monsters.

2.4 The concept of otherness

Literature is the perfect place for society to put its uncertainty and transgressive ideas. We need somewhere to address and discuss fascinating and terrifying notions such as the moral monster, and literature provides us with a tool in order to do this. It can help us understand terrifying and challenging notions, through a narrative structure that is familiar to all the members of society. Not only is it a tool, it also provides us with a sphere where we can put the transgressive features and characters, which is at a safe distance from the rest of the culture.

Literature and myth provide places where one can express things that cannot be said elsewhere. They employ divisions that function to uphold society, as they create structure and boundaries. These help us construct ideas, but also to deconstruct, as it challenges existing structures and categories. This process of construction and deconstruction can help society to evolve and rethink old ideas. Crises and apocalypses can also be explored and dealt with through the use of literary narratives. Literature provides a sphere where the abject, something that disturbs or undermines established order, is unveiled and the 'Crises of the World' are discussed.

Through literature, the members of society might gain a better knowledge of the religious, moral and ideological codes of the culture. Abjection in itself threatens the human

17

society because it is transgressive. Through abjection in literature, which is both unapproachable and intimate, society might let its fear and fascination in regards to the transgression of normative borders unfold (Kristeva 207-208).

Humans who have breached the law are guilty of transgression, whether we are talking about the judicial law or the normative rules, and can therefore be seen as 'others'. In the chapter "British Gothic fiction, 1885-1930", Kelly Hurley (2002) states that he transgressive human is often categorised as an *abhuman*. It is a liminal body who exists on 'the threshold between the two terms of an opposition' (Hurley 2002:190) for instance between human and beast or the civilised and primitive, and has lost its integral identity. It becomes a sort of half-human, while at the same time has a human form, and this presents a threat towards 'the integrity of human identity'.

When a person is categorised as an abhuman, s/he is immediately categorised as 'other'. There is a need for 'otherness' in order to create a sense of self and normative borders, and the transgressive bodies of peripheral figures such as the human monster provide a way to do this. The human monster 'demands a radical thinking of boundaries and normality' and forces us to think about the way we structure our culture. As we have seen, it always seems to appear at a time of crisis, and has an 'ontological liminality' that threatens the rules of society. It will continue to escape categorisation in order to return to 'its habitation at the margins of the world' at a later point in time (Cohen 1996:6).

'The monster is the limit' Foucault (1975) claims. He argues that its ability to combine both the impossible and the forbidden makes it a creature that contradicts the law in a way that prevents it from punishing the moral monster the same way it does 'normal' persons. The monster manages to transgress the law, due to the fact that both the monster and its monstrous behaviour are so rare and extreme phenomena, the law does not know how it should react in order to provide relevant punishment (Foucault 1975:56).

The human monster is, consequently, closely linked to 'otherness'. It manifests what is considered unacceptable social behaviour, what is on the 'outside' of society and its judicial and normative boundaries. In her book *Monstrosity – The Human Monster in Visual Culture,* Alexa Wright (2013) claims that the notion of otherness 'has come to be integrally related to notions of representation' in the way that we need this 'otherness' as a contrast in order to create a representation of the self (Wright 2013:17). Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (1994) supports this view when he claims that 'the monster is difference made flesh', a 'dialectical Other' that is placed on the '[o]utside' but is originally from '[w]ithin' (Cohen 1996:7).

As we have seen, the concept of the other is always created. Traditionally, human 'otherness' has been constructed as a result of a hierarchical relationship between self and other, based on 'race, sexuality, gender or physical disability' (Wright 2013:18). The main factor behind this is the wish to give strength to the existing power of the ruling classes in society. In Western society the heterosexual, white male has been the dominant figure that the 'other' has been established against. This standard has been used as a tool in order to distinguish the good, familiar and safe, from the evil, unfamiliar and dangerous (Wright 2013:18).

The reason why the moral monster is particularly threatening is because it is a deviant 'other' and a binary opposite to the conforming 'normal' individuals. The monster is a figure that embodies traits and qualities that can be difficult to identify, which is for instance exemplified by the monsters in the Middle Ages, which were a mixture of the animal and human. Because of this problem of categorisation they fall outside of the laws and normative rules, and thereby pose a threat to society. As a result, otherness becomes more difficult to detect, and this is a frightening idea in a society that is based on strict categorisation through binary opposites.

Cohen (1996) argues that '[t]he monster always escapes because it refuses easy categorisation' (Cohen 1996:6). If the moral monster cannot be situated or categorised, the laws of society cannot punish its monstrous behaviour, and this causes a problem. This makes it threaten our feeling of 'self', as the monster's behaviour is so extreme and different from the rest, but refuses to be categorised as 'other'. To prevent this, we need to place it on the limits of society or, preferably, on the outside in order to maintain the boundaries between 'other' and 'self', 'abnormal' and 'normal'. This is, however, challenging since the monster refuses such a categorisation.

The otherness of the moral monster also points at problematic aspects of the law. Foucault claims that when faced with monstrous behaviour, the law itself cannot come up with a response, which makes the monster able to violate it while 'leaving it with nothing to say' (Foucault 1975:56). It 'violates the law by its very existence' while it at the same time stands outside it. The response triggered by the monstrous behaviour is outside the law; it can cause a violent response, suppression, or medical care and pity, Foucault argues (Foucault 1975:56). The monster stands outside the law and is in that regards 'the spontaneous, brutal, but consequently natural form of the unnatural' (Foucault 1975:55-56). It is a notion that challenges both the judicial and medical systems, since it embodies all the deviations in nature, and forms a major model of these. It can be seen as the exception that constitutes

otherness in a system of knowledge and power that is established within a society (Foucault 1975:56, 61-62). When the monster embodies all the deviations, that is, everything that is opposite of 'normal', it also embodies otherness.

The laws of a culture will change according to the changes within the culture as a whole. This is also the case for the 'transformative force' of the human monster, as it is a result of the culture it emerges from, and the laws within that culture. Through this transformative force it effects how society defines the normative boundaries, and the limits of human behaviour and identity. Consequently, it also effects what is categorised as 'other' and helps society evolve the definition of this as well.

'Otherness' is always created; it is never something that is randomly come across. Just as the monster, the 'other' represents something that stands on the outside of the normative boundaries, because of its deviant features. This quality makes it essential when society constructs and develops its norms, as it presents an opposite in which the 'normal' members of society can compare themselves to. As mentioned, Richard Kearney states that 'in a sense we may say that monsters are our *others* par excellence. Without them we know not what we are. Without them we are not what we know' (Kearney, cited in Wright 2013:17).

The construction of the 'other' is closely linked to the construction of the 'self' and the position and point of view of the subjective observer (Wright 2013:17). These are all terms that continually change, and this quality makes it challenging to define them. Wright turns to the anthropologist Malcolm Crick (1976) for definition:

> A change in the value of the 'self' invariably alters the image of the 'other' and vice versa; and either change alters the nature of the difference which they constitute and by which they are constituted… there can be no final definition of the relation between 'ourselves' and 'others' (Crick, cited in Wright 2013:18).

To create a self, one consequently needs the other. David Ross Fryer (2004) argues that the creation of other gives function and a purpose to the self, and it can only be seen through the eyes of the other (Fryer 2004:31-32). We need an 'other' in order to find purpose and meaning, and Fryer also states that 'the self finds itself as subject always and only in/through the eyes of the other' (Fryer 2004:32). In other words, the 'other' is a crucial binary opposite that we are dependant on in order to establish the meaning of 'self'.

2.7 The texts

The two TV-series *The Fall* and *Hannibal* are especially relevant to investigate as they both portray a modern serial killer who is able to hide his abnormality, and thereby secures a place within society. The moral monsters in *The Fall* and *Hannibal* are able to challenge core ideas and values within society, such as gender roles, stereotypes, protection and the hypocrisy that exist in modern times. The contemporary moral monster portrayed in the two series apparently functions well in social situations, and is able to prevent his closest family, friends and colleagues from detecting the doubleness in his personality. He has a sort of double self, which enables him to hide certain traits of his persona from the people around him. This feature makes it possible to transgress normative and juridical laws without anyone knowing. The serial killer thereby represents a form of transgression and otherness that questions the way we view our society and categorise its members. A result of the serial killer's ability to function well in normal settings is that he manages to hide in plain sight, and thereby escape the categorisation as 'other'.

Another interesting feature of the two TV-series is the way they portray women. In *The Fall* one of the main characters, Stella Gibson, functions as a 'huntswoman' whose job it is to hunt down the serial killer. However, the series also presents female characters who become victims of the serial killer's transgressive actions. A similar presentation of women also occurs in *Hannibal*. All the women who have a somewhat close relationship with the serial killer end up as victims of his charm and manipulative behaviour. The way the two TV-series present women is interesting to investigate, as this can tell us something about how society views women.

The Fall is a TV-series set in modern day Belfast in Northern Ireland. The story evolves around the serial killer Paul Spector who is attacking and killing young career women. From an outside perspective he seems like an ordinary man with an ordinary life, as he has got a wife, two young children and works as a grief-counsellor. His outward appearance is, in other words, normal and this prevents others from detecting his abnormal traits. This enables him to continue to hunt down and kill women, since no one suspects him of any transgressions in the first place.

When Paul continues to kill women, Superintendent Stella Gibson is called in from the Metropolitan Police in London, in order to help catch the killer. As her professional title confirms, she is a successful career woman whose job it is to hunt down criminal individuals such as Paul. She is a determined, unmarried woman who appears to put her job before her

personal life. Even though she works within a field that is dominated by men, she has managed to get an important position, and is not afraid to talk against them. Her high rank suggests that she is a woman who challenges stereotypical gender roles, in the sense that she has a position that us mostly held by men.

This feature is important when it comes to Stella as a character, since she proves to challenge the gender roles of Western society even further, throughout the series. It turns out that she does not only do this through her profession, but also through her sexuality, which appears to be more similar to what is considered 'masculine' sexuality than 'female' sexuality. The viewers get to learn how she prefers to have brief, sexual encounters as opposed to long-term relationships.

In Western society, where the norm is that women should get married and stay monogamous, this can be considered transgressive behaviour. Another interesting aspect about her sexuality is the fact that she appears to be bisexual. This is suggested in a scene where she kisses a female colleague, and make suggestions that they should go up to her hotel room together. Such actions go against the Western norm of heterosexuality, and can perhaps also be seen as transgressive in a way. Since Stella, as a highly ranked police officer, is supposed to be following the rules set by society, this disturbs categorisations and boundaries. Through her authoritative profession and liberal sexuality, Stella can be considered as a character who challenges the norms of Western society.

The American TV-series *Hannibal* is, like *The Fall*, set in contemporary Western society. It tells the story of Dr Hannibal Lecter, a psychiatrist who is portrayed as a normal, even highly respectable, member of society. Similar to Paul Spector in *The Fall*, Hannibal's appears to be normal, but proves to be an ambiguous character. It is revealed to the viewers that he is a serial killer who also eats his victims. This feature is particularly interesting since it offers a different kind of serial killer, which hence can offer another way of criticising society. Whereas the serial killer in *The Fall* mainly targets women, the cannibalistic serial killer in *Hannibal* poses a threat towards everyone in society. Still, his appearance does not give any signs of this, and this makes him particularly dangerous.

Just like Paul, Hannibal is capable to resist being categorised as 'other' by having a normal outward appearance. Through his line of work, manners and general way of being, he even manages to make people see him as a 'perfect gentleman'. This aspect is fascinating since it enables him to get close to people and make them invite him into their lives. He is a extremely seductive and manipulative character, and is able to hoodwink his surroundings.

This makes him similar to the wolf in "Little Red Riding Hood", who in Charles Perrault's version of the tale embodies seductive traits enables it to manipulate young girls.

An important aspect of Hannibal's manipulative traits is that he manages to trick his friends to join him in his transgressive behaviour, by cooking meals for them. He does this by not inform them that the dishes he prepares are made of human flesh. This is crucial, as the aspect of knowledge helps separate monstrous, intentional actions, from those made by people who are unaware that they are transgressing the borders.

Another main character in *Hannibal* is Will Graham. He is a criminal profiler headhunted by the FBI to assist them in several investigations, amongst them the search for the serial killer known as 'the Chesapeake Ripper'. In order to work as a part of an investigative team the FBI require a psychological assessment of him, and Hannibal is brought in to evaluate his mental state. This leads to a close relationship between the two, which consequently leads Will to suspect that Hannibal is not as normal as he claims to be.

Similar to Stella in *The Fall*, he proves to be an ambiguous character, whose line of work evolves around catching serial killers. It soon becomes clear that Will finds social interaction challenging, and his abnormality also surfaces when the series explains why he is working with the FBI. It turns out that he is able to emphasise with abnormal people such as serial killers, to such an extent that he is able to predict their next moves. This ability makes him a useful device for the FBI, but it also makes his surroundings question his true intentions when solving murder investigations.

The problem with Will appears to be his ambiguity and abnormal abilities, which make him difficult to categorise. Just like to Stella in *The Fall*, he has a profession that categorises him as normal, but still shows traits that can be categorised as abnormal or 'other'. This makes him useful to study, since he provides a good example of how the rules and categories of society fail to function in the way they are meant to.

As the series evolves, Will starts to suspect that Hannibal is not entirely who he claims to be. The viewers get to know that Hannibal is the serial killer known as 'the Chesapeake Ripper' and this is what Will also starts to reveal. When he tries to warn others about this, Hannibal uses his manipulative traits to frame Will as the serial killer they are hunting. Since Will is such an ambiguous character, it is easier for the FBI to believe that he is capable to perform monstrous and transgressive actions, than it is to suspect Hannibal.

The two serial killers presented in *The Fall* and *Hannibal* exemplifies many important features, which can be used to analyse various aspects of society. Just like fairy tales and mythic narratives, the TV-series can function as contemporary cautionary tales, as they tell us

about the hidden dangers in modern society where everything should be analysed and understood. They make us question whether it is the 'old wolf' that has returned, or if a new, modern, and perhaps more frightening kind of 'wolf' has emerged in the form of the monstrous serial killer. Whether or not it is an old or new 'wolf', it will be important to inquire what these modern narratives are trying to warn us about.

Chapter 3: Why we all hate women

Even a multiple murderer can have his share of good qualities. Or a pretty face

(The Fall, S01E05, 00:44:51-00:44:54)[3]

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will analyse the British TV-series *The Fall*, which is set in contemporary Belfast and evolves around the hunt for a serial killer who has been killing young women. The goal of the analysis is to examine the contemporary monsters the series presents, as well as who are victims of these kinds of modern monsters. These are important aspects to analyse since they can provide information about what the different characters say about modern Western society, as well as the structures and stereotypes it imposes on its members. In order to do this, monster theory will be used, as well as social theory and fairy tale theory. In contemporary times there is a focus on gender roles and equality, and this is also reflected in the series. In relation to this, feminist theory will also be applied in order to investigate what it says about the roles men and women are prescribed in contemporary Western society. The chapter also seeks to examine whether the series can be seen as a modern cautionary tale, which warns young women about the dangers that exist within the Western society today.

Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (1996) suggests that that 'curiosity is more often punished than rewarded' in contemporary Western society and its narratives. He argues that one ought to stay within the boundaries in order not to 'risk attack by some monstrous border patrol or (worse) to become monstrous oneself' (Cohen 1996:12). This implies that both men and women who see themselves as 'normal', might become monstrous simply by crossing the normative an judicial borders. This is problematic, as we will see, because the categories men and women have to fit within in the Western society are very strict, and leave little room for transgression. Since one of the core features of the monster is its transgressive behaviour, men and women who transgress the borders of society might risk being perceived as monstrous.

The Fall is a contemporary TV-series that revolves around Detective Superintendent Stella Gibson's (Gillian Anderson) search for the serial killer Paul Spector (Jamie Dornan). As mentioned earlier, Stella is brought in from London in order to review an unsolved murder

---

[3] All quotes from *The Fall* used in this thesis are my own transcriptions

investigation. She links it to several other murders, and discovers that they are in fact dealing with a serial killer.

The killer's identity is revealed to the viewers straight away as belonging to Paul Spector, a married man with two young children who works as a bereavement therapist. Paul has an appealing look, and his outward appearance gives the impression of a charismatic man who seems to function well in social situations. In other words, Paul seems to be a perfectly normal man. The actions he performs do however prove that his character is far more complex, and more dangerous than his outward appearance might suggest. He seems to be 'a wolf in disguise', who manages to transgress boundaries in a way that prevents him from being revealed as a male monster who threatens the safety of young women.

We have already looked at how "Little Red Riding Hood" has been used as a cautionary tale in Western society. Its function has been to prepare and warn young girls about what might happen if they go out in the world by themselves and do not follow the rules set by the older, more experienced members of society. Zipes (2006) claims that classical fairy tales, such as "Little Red Riding Hood", are being used 'in mutated forms through new technologies' to shed light on topics linked to 'our social life and the very survival of the human species' (Zipes 2006:xii-xiii). In contemporary times there is a greater focus on understanding human psychology, and one of the ways this might be done is through the use of narratives such as TV-series. Some television series, such as *The Fall*, present us with human beings who are moral monsters, and it would be intriguing to investigate why this is. Another fascinating aspect about these series is the way the monstrosities of such figures are presented.

The threat from moral monsters and the safety of the young girl or woman can be seen as topics or anxieties that are present in modern society. The contemporary TV-series *The Fall* is also a series that deals with the misogyny that exists in the Western society. The reason for this is that it evolves around a man who commits crimes that are almost always aimed at young, professional women. Even though Paul Spector never explicitly reveals why he is targeting young women, it is implied that he is sexually aroused by the acts he commits. Furthermore, he reveals that he enjoys to stalk and to be in control of women, to hunt them down as a prey before he kills them, just like a wolf.

The acts he commits are similar to the ones in the narratives of cautionary tales where the fear of sexual violation and rape of women has been discussed throughout the years. The issue of if, and how, women should take precautions when it comes to their own safety is a theme that runs through the entire series. These similarities makes it interesting to investigate

whether it could be read as a modern form of fairy tale, or cautionary tale, directed towards young women in the modern Western society.

Another aspect that would be useful to examine, is the way contemporary cautionary tales are presented. The way the storyline and the characters in *The Fall* are presented, it can perhaps be argued that the modern versions of such narratives follow the conservative structure of the older tales. That is, where men are perceived as wolves and women as Little Red Riding Hoods. This could perhaps say something about the culture we live in, and give an indication of how we view gender roles and the different challenges connected to these, today.

Society is not perfect, and there are members within it who are categorised as 'bad' and 'threatening'. However, there are also members who are considered 'good' and 'protective' and secure the sense of equilibrium. The need for equilibrium, or balance, is something that is not only present in literature, but also in society in general. In today's society the stereotypical 'bad' individual is the male monster, the serial killer. This is a sort of monster that can no longer be identified through physical appearance. The reason to this is that the modern male monster possesses a normal outward appearance, which hides his abnormalities.

This provides the character with an aspect that causes both fascination and terror, which makes it very popular in many contemporary narratives, for instance in TV-series. This is for instance the case in *The Fall,* where such a male monster can be found. This chapter will examine the modern male monster, the serial killer, in general, before looking into the one found in *The Fall* more closely. It seeks to investigate why it is difficult for society to detect him, and how this provides him with an opportunity to transgress the judicial and normative borders.

One of the most interesting aspects of the serial killer presented in contemporary popular culture is that the victims are most often female. This raises the important question of how young women can be protected in order not to become a victim of a male monster. Contemporary society seems to place the responsibility for women's safety on women themselves, and this aspect is something this chapter will explore. Since the killer in the TV-series shows hatred towards women, the concept of misogyny will also be discussed.

It can perhaps be argued that Western society not only teaches men to disfavour women, but that women are taught to do this as well. The continued creation of narratives such as the cautionary tale is a means to this, it might seem. This is because these are stories where women are divided into two categories. They are either rape victims, who in a way 'get

what they deserve', or they have taken precautions in order not to get raped, which mean they fully obey the rules of society. This belief is shared by everyone in society, both men and women, and is conveyed through narratives such as the cautionary tale.

Many contemporary TV-series try to address the different monsters that exist within the Western society, while at the same time problematizing what the monster is. Modern narratives are used to problematize the borders between good and bad in a much greater way than before, and this might lead to new insight about society. It could also shed light on the rules that hold society together, and how these impact those who live within the Western culture.

Further on, the analysis will shed light on the gender aspect of the series and how this is portrayed throughout the dialogue of the main characters. It will examine how the male monster can 'hide in plain sight', and how it poses a threat towards the young women of the contemporary Western society. It will have a partly feminist point of view and investigate how women in contemporary society are taught to be afraid of 'the big, bad wolf', and to take responsibility for their safety. It will also examine the different gender roles within Western society and how these might cause troubles for both men and women, as they are very limited and provide little room for transgression.

This problem will be examined in relation to the two main characters, Stella and Paul, who can be seen as both predators and victims at the same time. Their behaviour is transgressive in several ways and challenges the set boundaries of Western society. One of the aspects the analysis in this chapter will seek to look into, is what kind of response society provides for the different characters when they challenge and breech the borders.

This aspect, as well as the fact that the protection of women is addressed throughout the series, makes it natural to investigate whether *The Fall* can be regarded as a modern cautionary tale, which problematizes the boundaries between good and evil people. Also, it will investigate whether we can draw lines between this and older cautionary tales such as "Little Red Riding Hood". Finally, the chapter will try to shed light on whether it is the male monster that is the true monster, or if it actually is society itself that is monstrous.

3.2 Cautionary tales in contemporary Western culture

As we have seen, narrative has been, and still is, used as a tool in the process of civilising members of Western society. Marina Warner (2010) argues that made up stories imposes structure and order upon us (Warner 2010:19). Jack Zipes (2012) supports this view, and suggests that 'the tale does provide and reflect on the cultural boundaries within which the reader measures and validates his or her own identity' (Zipes 2012:67). This is important, because it means that we use 'otherness' in order to establish 'normality', and that we do this through the use of narrative.

The cautionary tale is supposed to provide a model for the members of society. It is supposed to give examples of role models, and provide warnings to young girls about who they should avoid, as well as to show young boys who not to become. Thus, they give clear instructions about how society is structured and categorised. Also, they state which of the categories and types of behaviour young girls and boys will need to identify with and display in order to stay within its borders.

According to Zipes (2006), one of the aspects that has secured the longevity of cautionary narratives is the fact that they 'popularize the conflicts that we humans have as moral animals' (Zipes 2006:132). These conflicts evolve around the expectation that everyone should follow the moral code that describes which behaviour is acceptable, and which behaviour is not. Cautionary tales are consequently important tools to teach us about these rules and moral codes, and Zipes argues that they are told in order to 'prepare and inform us about the unexpected' (Zipes 2006:131).

The gender aspect of cautionary tales such as "Little Red Riding Hood" is important, in the sense that they frequently address how young girls need to be careful in order to stay safe. Feminist critics of fairy tales have argued that these kinds of narratives are 'designed to foster the patriarchal control of women by promoting to young and impressionable readers the idea that women are either passive and good or active and evil' (Teverson 2013:6). This is especially linked to the story of "Little Red Riding Hood". Andrew Teverson (2013) argues that she is a 'vehicle' for 'moral ideas, reminding young girls to listen to their mothers and shun strange men'. Furthermore, he states that she exemplifies 'the oppression of women by men, a helpless victim, who is punished with rape because she does not heed the censures of male authority' (Teverson 2013:6).

Throughout *The Fall*, this gender aspect is discussed and criticised through the actions and dialogue of the characters. When Stella Gibson links the murders in Belfast to each other,

a pattern occurs that shows how the killer targets young, professional women. They are being stalked, hunted down, violated, and murdered in their own homes. Already in the first episode there is an incident where women's responsibility for their own safety is addressed. Before she gets killed, the serial killer's first victim, Sarah Kay, calls the police because she believes someone has broken into her house. Being a young woman who lives alone, she gets suspicious when she finds that some of her underwear has been neatly placed on her bed when she gets home one night. When the police arrives and finds no one is there, the male police officer asks Sarah about how much she has had to drink that night. He is, in other words, signalling that he believes she might be to blame for the attack if she has had too much to drink, and made herself an easy prey.

Even though she has tried to be safe by not drinking too much and ordering a taxi to get home, she is still criticised and accused of being paranoid. This is further emphasised when the same officer asks her whether the cat could have done it. This gives the impression that he does not take her claims seriously. It turns out that she is right, and the result is that she gets killed shortly after the police officers have left. She is a woman in need of protection who reacts right by calling the police, the protectors. Even though society considers this as the right reaction, it turns out that is not enough to keep her safe. The protectors do arrive, but they do not believe her at first and when they do it is too late, as she has already become a victim. In the end, the police are not able to secure her safety after all.

The fact that the police cannot provide protection for women is also addressed when Stella and her colleagues discuss a professional web page where one of the murder victims had a profile. When a colleague asks whether they should warn the rest of the members, Stella replies 'if we warn them, we have to protect them, and we don't have the resources' (The Fall S01E04:00:24:32). This can be seen as an implicit critique of society in general, which tells women to be cautious, but fails to provide the protection they need to stay safe.

The issue of whether and how women should take precautions when it comes to their own safety is theme that runs through the entire series. When Stella talks to Rose Stagg, another one of Paul's victims, about her past affair with him, she comments on an incident where he started to strangle her while she was asleep. She begins the story by stating how they had both been drinking 'perhaps too much', and ends it by saying 'I know it seems crazy, being in bed with a guy when you don't know anything about him, just his first name. I learnt my lesson.' (S01E04:00:56:45-00:57:00).

Rose's reply suggests that she has been taught a moral code, such as the one we learn through cautionary tales, which states that women should not act recklessly by drinking a lot

and having sexual relationships with strangers. She has not followed this norm, and it appears that she believes that this is why she ended up with a man who tried to strangle her. Zipes (2006) argues that the moral in cautionary tales such as Perrault's version of "Little Red Riding Hood" is that 'women are responsible for their own rape', not men (Zipes 2006:37). The reason to why these stories have been spread and gained such an important role is because the role men have had in the cultural sphere, and society in general. Zipes further claims that 'since his [Perrault's] communication fit the dominant ideology of his times shared by many women (and perhaps ours), his story competed with all others and became the dominant meme and remains so to this day' (Zipes 2006:38).

Western society is based on a patriarchal rule, and Zipes suggests that many of the classical fairy tales are 'reinforcing the social organization and mentality of patriarchal cultures', while at the same time open these up for discussion (Zipes 2006:229). They are narratives that are supposed to show and warn about what might happen if one does not follow the implicit rules. These stories are primarily directed towards young women, and function to inform them that if they follow the rules made by men in the patriarchal society, they will stay safe. Young women are, in other words, supposed to stay 'innocent'. They should not explore their own sexuality, or cross any other normative boundary, as they will end up as helpless victims if they do. Women are in other words restricted to the category of the victim who needs protection. However, it is not only the women who are confined to limited categories; it is also the case for men. The roles men are awarded are the binary couple of 'good' and 'bad', they must choose to be either huntsmen or wolves. What is problematic with these roles, as well as the one for women, is that there is very little room for transgression. Because the roles men and women are awarded are so restricted, they cannot transgress any borders without being labelled as 'bad' or 'wolves', or 'victims who are to blame'.

Furthermore, while men in Western society are seen as either innocent or guilty, women seem to be blamed both if they are not as innocent as they are supposed to be and if they are *too* innocent. In the OED, the term *innocent* is defined as someone who is 'not guilty of a crime or offence', or a 'simple' and 'a pure, guileless, or naïve person' (Oxford English Dictionaries online, 2016). In other words, if a person wants to be innocent s/he cannot transgress either the judicial or the normative borders. It is interesting that an innocent person by definition is described as 'simple' and 'naïve', terms that are not necessarily perceived as positive. The definitions imply that such a person might be tricked easily, and become a victim.

The subject of innocence is addressed in *The Fall* as Stella discusses the media strategy they are going to use with her colleagues. In relation to the statement they are planning to send out, Stella discusses the use of the word 'innocent' and how this includes a judgment of value:

Stella Gibson:	"Let's not refer to them as 'innocent'"
Jim Burns:	"They were innocent"
Stella Gibson:	"What if he kills a prostitute next? Or a woman walking home drunk, late at night, in a short skirt? Will they be in some way less innocent, therefore less deserving, culpable? The media loves to divide women into virgins and vamps, angels or whores. Let's not encourage them"

(The Fall, S01E03:00:29:03-00:29:31)

As we see in this dialogue, females are still placed within two different categories: innocent or not innocent, angels or whores. These are categorisations that are made by society, and are not usually applied when talking about men. The 'angels' are those who follow the rules and norms, who listen to their mothers and the patriarchs, whereas the 'whores' are those who do not follow the path set out by these, and thereby risk being attacked by the monsters that inhabits the world.

Stella herself gets to experience this kind of strict categorisation after she has had a one-night stand with James Olson, a colleague who turned out to be married. When the media find out about this, they portray her as some sort of 'marriage-wrecker'. This is, however, not the case, as she did not know he was married. Still, the story in itself is enough for them to label her a 'whore'.

Zipes (2006) argues that the mass media's presentation of images and stories 'tends to follow Perrault and continues to suggest that women lure and seduce men and ultimately are responsible if anything happen to them' (Zipes 2006:39). This is also the case when it comes to Stella's relationship to James Olson. Even though she does not get raped or killed, she is being labelled as a whore by the media and thereby receives a sort of punishment.

The story about Stella's relationship that is presented by the media is based on gossip, a term that is defined in the OED as 'casual or unconstrained conversation or reports about other people, typically involving details which are not confirmed as true' (Oxford English

Dictionaries online, 2016). In her book *From the Beast to the Blonde,* Marina Warner (1995) argues that gossip is a means that could be used in order to 'achieve considerable, even dangerous, influence' (Warner 1995:49). Gossip is also linked to the function of fairy tales, because they provide a narrative in which 'the old can oppress the young with their prohibitions and prejudices as well as enlighten them' (Warner 1995:49). The function of fairy tales can be said to carry information from the 'older' members of society, as they promote existing stereotypes and describe what is considered prohibited behaviour.

The narratives of fairy tales convey important information about which values are seen as important within society, and are used to instruct the members about 'who is trusted and who is not, about what is considered praiseworthy and what is condemned, about alliances and enemies, hopes and dangers' (Warner 1995:49). As the contemporary Western society is mainly patriarchal in structure, the media continues to convey the moral message that women are responsible for what happens to them if they transgress the normative boundaries of sexuality.

Since one of the core aspects of fairy tales is that everyone in a society knows them, they can function as an important teaching device. The important position the media has in modern Western society also makes it a tool as to convey the ideas and values of the dominant groups within society. Just like the fairy tales, they can emphasise who are perceived as 'enemies', what behaviour is praiseworthy and the aspects of society that should be considered dangerous. This suggests that they can function as a modern form of the cautionary tale, which aim it is to warn about threats within society, as well as conveying proper behaviour.

It could perhaps be argued that media, or maybe even the cautionary tales themselves, have taken over the role that used to be possessed by 'the old', in contemporary society. Today, the media often provide stories that are not confirmed, such as the one regarding Stella, but are perceived as true by the other, 'young' members of society. This is perhaps also the case for cautionary tales, as the gender roles and stereotypes these present appears to be accepted in contemporary society. Through reports and stories the media convey praiseworthy and condemned behaviour and ideas, and reach out to the members of society who are taught to believe that what they read is true. Yet again, cautionary tales have the same effect, as they too convey and value some kinds of behaviour, and disapprove of others. *The Fall* shows how gossip that is presented in the media gains dangerous influence, as it has a clear effect on how people regard Stella afterwards. The way media portray her does perhaps make her less

trustworthy as a police officer, when they present her as someone who has crossed a normative boundary.

Another interesting aspect about Stella's brief relationship is that she frequently has to defend her choice to her male colleagues. Stella's lover is killed the day after their one-night stand, and because of this one of her bosses questions her about their affair. After she has told him that the intention of the meeting was sexual intercourse, he asks her about some multimedia messages she received, but never opened:

Stella Gibson: "I didn't open them"
Matt Eastwood: "Why?"
Stella Gibson: "I didn't want to"
Matt Eastwood: "Because he was a married man?"
Stella Gibson: "I didn't know that at the time"
Matt Eastwood: "But you didn't think to ask?"
Stella Gibson: "He didn't think to tell me. I know nothing that will help you
                    with your inquiry and I have a lot of work to do"
Matt Eastwood: "Yeah"

(The Fall, S01E03, 00:50:19-00:50:53)

Even though Olson never told Stella that he was a married man, it still seems like Eastwood blames Stella. Once again she has to defend her sexual relationship, and once again she is the one who gets categorised as immoral. The fact that Eastwood asks her why she didn't try to find out whether he was married or not, implies that it is the woman who is responsible for knowing whether a sexual encounter such as the one between Stella and James Olson is approved of or condemned. This is further emphasised as the conversation goes on:

Matt Eastwood: "When did you first meet Sergeant Olson?"
Stella Gibson: "That's really what bothers you, isn't it? The one-night stand.
                    Man fucks woman. Subject, man. Verb, fucks. Object, woman.
                    That's OK. Woman fucks man. Woman, subject. Man, object.
                    That's not so comfortable for you, is it?"

(The Fall, S01E03, 00:50:58-00:51:28)

Here, Stella points out the hypocrisy of Eastwood's attitude. Apparently, he believes it is more natural if a man has a one-night stand or even an adulterous relationship, as longs as he is the one who takes initiative. He will not be labelled a 'whore'. However, if it is the other way around, if it is a woman who takes initiative, the action will be seen as sinful. This goes against the view the Western society has on relationship, where it has been common for the man to be in control, set the terms, and define the rules.

When women go against this, they break the norm and can thereby be categorised as bad or, to some extent, the ones to blame. They are faced with the problem of innocence, similar to how Little Red Riding Hood is blamed for not being innocent enough when she talks to the strange wolf, or too innocent, in the way that she is naïve. She does not 'heed the censures of male authority', and therefore she needs to be punished by getting labelled. This also makes her a sort of victim of her own sex. Cohen (1996) states that when women cross the boundaries of their gender roles, their behaviour is considered deviant. This kind of deviant sexual identity is often 'susceptible to monsterization' (Cohen 1996:10). The monster 'embodies those sexual practices that must nor be committed' and 'enforces the cultural codes that regulate sexual desire', he argues (Cohen 1996:14). In other words, women who transgress the normative boundaries in regards to gender and sexuality risk being seen as some sort of monsters, by performing sexual actions that are considered deviant by society.

According to Marina Warner, Little Red Riding Hood's behaviour has been condemned because she was 'laying herself open to the wolf's wickedness' by stopping to pick flowers. Whereas the belief has been that the wolf does not know any better 'Red Riding Hood should have been better brought up' (Warner 1995:243). This also reinforces the idea that it is the girl's responsibility to stay safe. Society needs to teach her how to do this, as men with wolfish traits do not know any better, and are therefore not responsible for their own behaviour.

Further on, Warner points at how the story has often been published with subtitles such as 'The Effect of Female Curiosity' and 'The Fatal Effects of Curiosity', which clearly suggests that women should not show this kind of behaviour. These were supposed to put focus on the fact that it is a cautionary tale 'about women's innate wickedness' (Warner 1995:244). Because women were believed to be unable to control their 'inner wickedness' they would need the protection of men, who would then secure their role as the leaders and protectors in the patriarchal society. Women have not been supposed to show any kind of curiosity, especially not in regards to sexuality, as this would make them easy targets for men

with wolf-like traits. Zipes (2006) supports this view, as he states that Perrault's version of "Little Red Riding Hood" focuses on the fact that 'sex is obviously sinful' and that sexual relationships outside of marriage is 'likened to rape, which is primarily the result of the little girl's irresponsible acts' (Zipes 2006:35-36).

As a contrast to this, Stella is a woman who seems to reject the traditional gender roles of society. She tries to discuss the murder victims without making value judgements, ignores the normative rules that put limitations on her sexual behaviour, and seems annoyed when male colleagues try to protect her. She is a strong, independent woman who has a highly ranked position in the police, and instructs her staff in an authoritative way that is so natural that it is never questioned by any of her male colleagues. This is not a kind of behaviour that is often associated with femininity, and Stella's way of being might therefore be seen masculine.

The impression that Stella has many masculine behavioural traits is emphasised by the nature of her relationships, which tend to be brief and purely sexual. In patriarchal Western society there has been a tendency to expect women's sexuality to be restricted to the sphere of marriage, whereas the men have had more sympathy in regards to non-marital relationships. The last few decades this view has changed a lot, but even today there is still a tendency that points in this direction, as women are still getting stigmatised if they have many non-marital, purely sexual relationships. The fact that the term 'slut shaming' exists proves this. According to OED, *slut shaming* is 'the action or fact of stigmatizing a woman for engaging in behaviour judged to be promiscuous or sexually provocative' (Oxford English Dictionaries online, 2016). This shows the double standards in the Western society when it comes to sexuality and gender.

If women do get involved in these kinds of relationships, they are at least expected to feel guilty about it. This is exemplified by Jim Burns' reaction when Stella tells him about the night she spent with James. After informing her that he was married and had kids, to which she replies that he was not wearing a ring, Jim tries to make her feel guilty by saying 'I'm sure that'll be of some comfort to his wife, when she finds out that her husband spent his last day on Earth in your bed' (The Fall, S01E03, 00:26:04-00:26:10). As the conversation goes on, it is revealed that Stella and Jim also have had an affair, while he was married. Once again the male hypocrisy regarding adultery is apparent, since Stella, the woman, is the one who gets blamed for the inappropriate relationship. This implies that in the patriarchal Western society women are always the ones who are responsible when something bad happens. This further suggests that the concept of misogyny, a 'dislike of, contempt for, or ingrained

prejudice against women', exists within the Western society (Oxford English Dictionaries online, 2016).

Misogyny is also a theme that is dealt with in *The Fall*. Except from one, Paul Spector's victims are all women, carefully selected because of their sex. While being questioned by Stella, Paul admits to having had violent sexual fantasies since the age of 12. When she asks him what kept him from acting upon those fantasies until the age of 30, he replies that he has always had 'a project', a woman to study and stalk (The Fall S02E06, 00:44:36). Stella goes on to question him about his hatred towards women, and what his murder victims had done in order to become a victim. She also points out the hypocrisy in regards to him targeting female victims, while at the same time wishes to protect his daughter Olivia, and questions him about what makes her special:

Stella Gibson:	"All of your victims are daughters. Where did your hatred for women come from?"
Paul Spector:	"I don't hate women. I hate everyone and everything, including myself"
Stella Gibson:	"Olivia?"
Paul Spector:	"'Once a man has achieved contempt for himself, he achieves contempt for all man-made laws and moralities and is truly free to do what he wills'"
Stella Gibson:	"You are under arrest. You're going to prison. In what sense are you free?"
Paul Spector:	"I live at a level of intensity unknown to you and others of your type. You will never know the almost god-like power that I feel when that last bit of breath leaves a body. The feeling of complete possession"

(The Fall, S02E06, 00:53:30-00:54:21)

This is the closest the series gets in regards to explaining why Paul has acted the way he has. Even though he argues that he hates everyone, all but one of his victims are women who he has hunted down and strangled. However, the reason he gives to why he killed Joe Brawley, one of his victims' brother, suggests that he might in fact hate men as well, even though they

are not his main targets. At the night the murders take place, Paul has broken into Annie Brawley's house in order to prepare the kill, when Annie and her brother get home. Paul manages to catch Annie, but while he is trying to strangle her, Joe arrives. This results in a fight where Paul ends up killing him. When Stella questions Paul about the attack, she also asks him about the fight between him and Joe:

Paul Spector: "You couldn't call it a fight. It was more of a mismatch. He came into the room, I was strangling his sister, armed with a heavy piece of wood. The best he could muster was a blow against the back. What kind of bourgeoisie nonsense, the influence of parents, teachers, the church, police officers, contrives to make you incapable of crushing another man's skull, even to save your sister? In that moment, his squeamishness, whatever the fuck, in that moment he sealed his fate and he should have sealed hers. A miserable worm bleating, 'Annie, Annie.' He deserved to die chocking in a pool of blood, piece of shit […]"

(The Fall S02E06, 00:56:15-00:57:14)

In this monologue, Paul reveals that he also has hatred towards men who he sees as 'weak' and not able to protect themselves or others. He blames the institutions and important people in society for this, as they have taught the other members rules that prevent them from committing acts that might save them in extreme situations. It seems as if he argues that society prevents people from bringing out their 'inner wolf' in situations where he believes this is needed. Ironically, Paul's behaviour makes him unable to protect the people he cares about too, such as his daughter Olivia, by committing actions that break the judicial boundaries and have him put into prison. This will also be the result for others, if they were to break the judicial laws in order to protect themselves from what they believe is a threat.

This could suggest that Paul believes that one is a lesser being, in a way, if one stays within the boundaries that have been created by society. If one always follows the rules and never makes transgressions, one is *too* innocent, and this can be dangerous. As we have seen, being too innocent makes one naïve, just like Little Red Riding Hood, which is negative. One is thereby neither able to protect oneself nor the people one cares about. This is problematic,

as the contemporary Western society proves not to be able to provide the proper protection for its members.

Paul Spector is a man who has a very extreme hatred towards women, but it does also turn out that misogyny is present among 'normal' men as well. Most men do not express this as explicitly as Paul does, but it is from time to time brought into light through short comments and remarks. Even though these comments are not expressed as strongly and frequently, they do expose the problem of misogyny that exists within Western society. This is for instance illustrated when Stella and her colleagues discuss the murder cases and there is a question about whether the killer hates women who occupy powerful positions, and a male police officer replies 'don't we all?' (The Fall, S01E03, 00:53:16). This suggests that even though Paul's opinions on women are extreme, the core belief is shared by a lot of men who do not consider their behaviour as abnormal.

The series makes the viewers question whether other, 'normal' men can find Paul fascinating or compelling. Many men might have what is considered abnormal sexual fantasies, but the judicial and normative rules of society prevent them from fulfilling them. Paul Spector ignores these rules and has the audacity to realise them. As detective superintendent Tom Anderson argues when discussing the serial killer with Stella: 'there is something fascinating about him. A strange allure' (The Fall, S02E06, 00:06:12). Stella's reply insinuates that the reason why Anderson, as a man, might find Paul interesting is because he has no need to fear him:

Stella Gibson: "A woman, I forgot who, once asked a male friend why men felt threatened by women. He replied that they were afraid that women might laugh at them. When she asked a group of women why they felt threatened by men… they said… 'we're afraid they might kill us'. He might fascinate you. I despise him with every fibre of my being"

(The Fall, S02E06, 01:06:22-01:07:04)

Since misogyny might appear to be a relatively common feature in any patriarchal society, the question of how women might protect themselves from men becomes an important topic. The fact that male monster might be hidden in plain sight, makes it problematic for women to

protect themselves. Stella and her female colleague Dr Reed Smith, who is assigned to Stella's team, discuss this as they examine the apartment of one of the murder victims:

Stella Gibson:	"What will you tell your daughters in the future? About how to stay safe?"
Dr Reed Smith:	"Pretty much what I tell them now. Don't talk to strange men"
Stella Gibson:	"'Strange' men?"
Dr Reed Smith:	"Any man"

(The Fall, S01E04, 00:27:49-00.28:36)

The answer 'don't talk to strange men' is consistent with the message that is the core of Western cautionary tales: if you do not talk to strangers, but follow the advice set by your mother and the patriarchal society, you will stay safe. However, as Stella points out, this rule of thumb is not enough anymore. If the male monster can disguise himself in a way that enables him to hide in plain sight, there is no way of detecting him. As Paul Spector's appealing looks shows, the modern male monster cannot be identified through visual signs. Neither can his abnormality be detected through his everyday appearance, as he appears to be a charismatic, socially competent husband and father with a good job. The fact that the serial killer might be any man, forces women to widen the category of potential threatening men, which in the end forces them to consider every man a potential threat towards their safety. The male monster thereby becomes omnipresent.

Because the serial killer in *The Fall* preys on young women, it is natural to question why it is this part of the population that is being targeted. As we have seen, the answers provided by Dr Reed Smith are very similar to the instructions given in classical cautionary tales; do not talk to strange men, or wolves. In Perrault's version of "Little Red Riding Hood", there is a part in the end that is called the 'moral'. This short poem describes the dangers young girls 'whose orient rosy Blooms begin t'ppear' need to know about'. He warns that they might be easily persuaded and might listen to 'all sorts of tongues', but that these might belong to the seductive wolf. The wolves, he claims, can have different shapes and sizes. Some might be 'mild and gentle-humour'd' but they 'with luring tongue, and language wondrous sweet' will 'follow young ladies as they walk the street'. In the end he warns that these urban wolves, which one cannot detect because of their charming appearance, might prove to be the most dangerous ones (Perrault, cited in Zipes 1993:93-94).

Warner (1995) argues that Perrault's ending introduces a new understanding as it suggests that the wolf is not a savage 'other', located far away, but rather someone who is familiar and located within society. He thereby turns the identity of the wolf upside-down, as it no longer represents 'the savage wilderness, but [for] the deceptions of the city and the men who wield authority in it' (Warner 1995:183). This way, it can perhaps still be relevant, as a device in order to reflect upon the 'modern wolf' that lurks in the urban Western society.

In a way, *The Fall* might be seen as a modern kind of cautionary tale, as it provides young girls and women with a modern narrative that makes them aware of the danger that are present in contemporary society, which is the serial killer disguised as an 'everyman'. It is constructed in the same way as other cautionary tales where there is a state of equilibrium that is disturbed and a huntsman, or woman in this case, whose job it is to catch the villain of the story. It seeks to fulfil our Epistemophilia, our need for knowledge, in the way that the huntswoman, Stella, is trying to find the explanation to the villain's, Paul's, monstrous actions.

However, as Paul never explicitly reveals why he acts the way he does, the viewers never get to experience a catharsis and our Epistemophilia is never fulfilled. This reflects real life, where there is no guarantee of getting an explanation for monstrous actions such as those performed by male monsters. Thereby we never get to know how they can be detected, which means that it becomes difficult to teach young women how to stay safe.

The monster is not an island that has appeared out of the blue, it does not come from a vacuum, but is rather a product of society in which it is created. 'Monsters are our children' Cohen (1996) states and argues that they must be analysed based on the different social, cultural and literary-historical relations within society in which they are created (Cohen 1996:5, 20). Further on, Cohen suggests that '[t]he monster resists any classification built on hierarchy or a merely binary opposition, demanding instead a "system" allowing polyphony, mixed response (difference in sameness, repulsion in attraction), and resistance to integration' (Cohen 1996:7). This suggests that the monster will never tolerate a society such as the contemporary one of the Western world, which is built upon strict categories and binary thinking.

The anxiety of the modern male monster sheds light on one of the most interesting topics within the contemporary Western society, which is the fact that there is no way that we can create a society that is absolutely safe. Today, the Western society evolves around a system where the responsibility of the protection of women is placed on women themselves, and where both men and women are assigned strict roles. This system does neither seem to

provide the necessary protection, nor create a sphere where men and women can transgress any borders without being categorised as 'bad' or 'guilty'. This implies that there is a need for a different system and that the real monster is not necessarily the man, but could in fact be society itself.

3.3 All the Little Red Riding Hoods

When Cohen argues that the monster is a product of its time, he implies that we get the monsters we deserve. We have seen that in the patriarchal Western society, the cautionary tales suggest that all men have traits from the wolf they cannot control, which consequently makes women responsible for their own safety. This has eventually led to the formation of the modern male monster, the serial killer, which all women need to protect themselves from.

Because the cautionary tales make all men are potential wolves, they also make women potential Red Riding Hoods, or victims in a way. As mentioned earlier, Perrault's ending of "Little Red Riding Hood" focuses on the fact that the most dangerous wolves are those who are charming and capable of hiding in plain sight, and not possible to detect straight away.

In *The Fall*, Paul Spector operates as such a 'wolf in disguise', as he has an outward appearance that conceals his abnormality and wolfish traits. He is a man who has got a wife and kids who love him, and also a steady job as a bereavement counsellor, which are aspects that make him seem normal, like all other men. Spector's ability to stay 'invisible' also becomes clear when the police interrogate his wife, Sally, about his whereabouts on the nights of the murders. Since he can hide his abnormality, he has managed to persuade her to provide him with a fake alibi earlier:

Matt Eastwood: "It seems he never indulged his sexual perversities with her, and
                    he was only ever a kind and apparently loving father. The truth
                    is she knows nothing about him"
Stella Gibson: "So stupid and incurious, but innocent"

(The Fall S02E06, 00:35:38-00:36:10)

42

Paul Spector has thereby been able to hide his monstrous behaviour so well that not even his wife has had any idea what he has been doing. This is a frightening aspect, as it suggests that human monsters might be everywhere, just like Warner (2010) claims when she states that there is 'a new breed of monster, who […] isn't ultimately alien, but my brother, my self' (Warner 2010:21). In other words, the monster can be anyone and everyone around you, it is no longer a mythical creature that originates in nature, but a real person, a human monster.

The fact that the monster can be someone close to you is exemplified in *The Fall* as Sally has never suspected him of any abnormal behaviour. She can be compared to Perrault's Little Red Riding Hood, who is portrayed as a 'pretty, spoiled, gullible, and helpless' girl who should have been paying more attention (Zipes 1993:26). Sally has believed all the lies Paul has told her, and as a result she has never been unable to reveal his abnormal behaviour. However, one of the main points of cautionary tales is that the wolves are difficult to detect namely because they are so charming, alluring, and able to conceal their abnormality in a way that makes it problematic to separate the wolf from the huntsman.

The fact that the wolf might be anyone and anywhere is also commented on in the series when Paul drives by their 15-year-old babysitter, Kate Benedetto, who is out walking alone. Paul sees her, pulls over, and asks her whether she wants him to drive her home:

Paul Spector:	"You going home?"
Kate Benedetto:	"Yes"
Paul Spector:	"Do you want a lift?"
Kate Benedetto:	"I'm OK walking"
Paul Spector:	"Haven't you heard? There's a strangler on the prowl?"
Kate Benedetto:	"Are you going to protect me?"

(The Fall, S01E04, 00:28:53-00:29:15)

In the end, Kate accepts his proposal to drive her home, and gets in the car. This dialogue shows how Paul, the wolf, manages to charm the young girl and make her believe he is a 'good guy', or a huntsman who is there to protect her. Even when he points out that there is a predator lurking among them, his true identity is not revealed and he continues to trick the women around him. What proves to be problematic with Paul's abnormal traits is that he manages to hide them and to charm people into trusting him, just like the young babysitter does. Even though nothing happens to Kate at that point, she is still too innocent to detect his

monstrousness. Just like Little Red Riding Hood, her naïve innocence makes her an easy prey to the monstrous men with wolfish traits, who lurk within society.

Stella is also a sort of victim of the wolfish, and apparently uncontrollable, traits of men. This is reflected in *The Fall* when she is discussing Paul with her boss, Jim Burns. The conversation takes place after a meeting in her hotel room the night before, when Jim vigorously tried to persuade Stella to have sex with him:

Jim Burns:	"He's not a human being. He's a monster"
Stella Gibson:	"Stop Jim. Please, just stop"
Jim Burns:	"What?"
Stella Gibson:	"You can see the world in that way if you want, you know it makes no sense to me. Men like Spector are all too human, too understandable. He's not a monster. He's just a man"
Jim Burns:	"I'm a man. I hope to God I'm nothing like him"
Stella Gibson:	"No, you're not. But you still came to my hotel room, uninvited, and mounted some kind of attack on me"
Jim Burns:	"It wasn't an attack. That's unfair, I was – I just wanted—"
Stella Gibson:	"What did you want?"
Jim Burns:	"I don't know"
Stella Gibson:	"To fuck me? Nail me, bang me, screw me?"
Jim Burns:	"I wouldn't use those words about you"
Stella Gibson:	"I was saying no, Jim. Quite clearly. You ignored me and carried on"
Jim Burns:	"It's not the same"
Stella Gibson:	"No, it's not the same. But you still crossed the line"

(The Fall S02E06, 00:38:50-00:40:10)

When Jim launched his attack on Stella, he showed that he is also a character that possesses traits and urges he cannot control. When Stella refuses to have sex with him, he ignores her and tries to carry on, and threatens her safety. In the end, she has to protect herself by hitting him in the face, to make him stop. Even though he did not finish his act, and did not rape Stella, his behaviour was threatening since he ignored her refusal and carried on.

The fact that Jim Burns tries to distinguish his own actions in the hotel room from those of Paul Spector's is interesting, because there are similarities between them. Whereas Jim wishes to categorise Paul as a monster, other than himself, Stella argues that things are not always as black and white. This conversation suggests that the distinction between 'normal' men and 'monsters' is problematic, and that the normative border between what is acceptable behaviour and what is not, is difficult to establish. The fact that Stella and Jim clearly have different opinions about the latter's actions that night further strengthens this belief.

When Jim claims that Stella's description of the incident as an 'attack' and a clear crossing of the line is unfair, it becomes clear that they do not have the same opinion of where the normative border is set when it comes to situations like the one in the hotel room. It appears that he does not believe that his actions were so transgressive that they should be seen as monstrous or threatening, even though Stella explicitly disagrees. Given Stella's description, Jim might be put in the same monster category in which Jim wishes to place Paul. Jim's actions imply that even men one knows well and do not believe will launch an attack might prove to do so anyway, and that the threat towards women thereby is everywhere.

One might understand the threat of the serial killer easily enough, but it is more problematic when men who are supposed to be 'good men', or 'huntsmen', also perform ambiguous actions. It eliminates the argument that 'I'm a nice guy, I could never do that', making all men a potential monster. This also emphasises an aspect of the cautionary tale that is problematic for men as well, as it leaves no room for men to transgress the normative even the slightest, as this would make them 'guilty'. The strict categorisation of men as being either 'good' or 'guilty' leaves no room for mistakes or small transgressions, even though most men transgress the borders from time to time.

This point is further strengthened by the comments made by Dr Reed Smith who states that she would not only warn her daughters from talking to some men, she would warn them about talking to *any* man. Even though she might be saying it as a joke, it points out the fact that any man might pose a potential threat towards them and that it is difficult to know who are 'good' and who are 'evil'. The fact that Paul Spector can commit the murders without his closest family and friends getting suspicious also emphasises this. Everyone knows that the threat of the wolf is there, but the series proves how it might be closer to you than you are aware of.

Even though the monstrous serial killer is present in society, we have seen that Foucault argues that the monster is an extreme creature only found in exceptional cases. The

structure of contemporary Western society appears, however, to deny a continuum between 'good' and 'monstrous' through the strict categorisation of men and women. This means that in order not to be labelled as monstrous, guilty, or responsible, men and women cannot transgress any normative or judicial borders in any way. The strict categorisation and lack of continuum is problematic because everyone transgresses such borders from time to time, as the different characters in *The Fall* show.

The fact that the Western cautionary tales perceive all women as victims, and all men as either good huntsmen or bad wolves, is problematic. As we have seen, one of the biggest problems with the modern society is that it is impossible to make it perfectly safe for women. The strict gender categories forces men to hide their mildly abnormal traits, which makes it difficult for women to separate those who are on the middle of the good/bad continuum, which is most men, and the extreme characters, the male monsters or serial killers. Because the belief within the Western society is that all men have traits of the wolf, a character that is deemed as monstrous in the cautionary tales, all men can be seen as monstrous.

This means that the Western society has categorised half of its population as monstrous, which is problematic. Still, the strict categories have until today continues to be presented in the cautionary tales of Western society. This underlines Cohen's argument that we get the monsters we deserve, and perhaps it is the cautionary tales in themselves that proves to be monstrous, in the end.

3.4 All the hunters and wolves

Paul Spector: "We're very alike, you and me"
Stella Gibson: "Oh, I don't think so"

(The Fall S01E05, 0:52:26-00:52:28)

The concepts of categorisation have proved to be problematic in the Western society, due to the strictness of the categories men and women have to adapt to. The lack of a continuum between 'good' and 'bad' in the post-modern society also makes transgressions of the boundaries problematic, as nothing and no one are clear-cut good or bad. The categories of the wolf and the huntsman, and the innocent or 'guilty' victims, presented in the cautionary tales seem to be too rigid, as they do not allow much transgression.

One of the most interesting aspects of *The Fall* is the different kind of hunters the series present through the actions of the various characters. These hunters are all crossing the normative and judicial rules, which makes transgression an important theme in *The Fall*. Jim Burns is one example of persons who transgress the borders. As mentioned, he attacks Stella in her hotel room and tries to force himself upon her even though she is protesting. This is, however, not the only time Jim crosses one of society's borders. He does for instance also break the judicial laws when he warns a colleague about a warrant of arrest that was out for his son, which gives the latter an opportunity to go into hiding.

Another person who breaks the normative rules is James Olson, who crosses the boundaries when committing adultery with Stella. The cases linked to Jim and James are interesting because they provide yet another example of how persons who are supposed to have a high moral standard, due to their occupation, transgress the normative and judicial borders too. Since both Jim and James are highly ranked police officers, someone who are supposed to protect the rest of the population from the lawbreakers within society, their transgressions are perhaps even more serious. Even though not all of their actions affect the entire society, they still imply that no one can be trusted to be who they say they are, not even the protectors, or 'huntsmen'.

It is, however, not only men who breach the laws. Several of the women also transgress either the judicial or normative laws, or both. Paul Spector's wife, Sally, does for instance break the judicial law when she provides him with a false alibi when she lies about having spent the evening with Paul when he was in fact committing a murder. This is also the case for the babysitter who Paul has falsely claimed to have a relationship to, in order to have an alibi for the nights he committed the other murders.

Stella also breaches the normative rules in relation to sexuality, with her many, brief relationships. For instance, she kisses Dr Reed Smith, her female colleague, one night they meet in a bar. When a man tries to flirt the latter, Stella moves in between them and kisses Dr Reed Smith. She even wants her to join her in her hotel room, but Dr Reed Smith gets cold feet and leaves as they are waiting for the elevator. Such behaviour is a clear violation of the norm that states that the male-female relationship is the proper type in Western society. Even though they do not fulfil the act, they are still challenging the normative boundaries.

The most obvious transgressive character in *The Fall* is, however, Paul Spector. His monstrous behaviour is not accepted in Western society, and as a result, he is categorised as both criminal and abnormal. In addition to his murderous traits, Paul's sexuality is also described as 'abberant' and 'way out on the sex continuum' (The Fall S02E06, 00:24:30,

S01E05, 00:42:42). He watches women, breaks into their homes, steals their underwear, and violates them, which is behaviour that is not considered 'normal' in the Western society.

Paul Spector can be seen as a predator who hunts down young women, in order to stalk, terrorise, violate and kill them. The fact that Paul's outward appearance does not give any reason for concern, is exemplified when Stella and her colleagues discuss Paul after he has been revealed as the killer. It turns out that they have not interrogated him thoroughly enough to detect his monstrousness:

Stella Gibson:	"Did you check those alibis face-to-face?"
Glen Martin:	"No ma'am. On the phone. He seemed like a good guy, bright, likeable, helpful. He let us take his prints, his DNA. It didn't seem as though he had anything to hide. A married man, a father of two, a bereavement counsellor."
Stella Gibson:	"Jesus, Glen. What have I been saying about such individuals from day one? They frequently appear to be charming, intelligent, charismatic. The key word is "appear". They have to be probed, wrong-footed, challenged. And why has nobody followed up with the list of children's homes that he gave?"

(The Fall S02E02, 00:52:36-00:53:24)

This conversation shows how Paul Spector manages to hide in plain sight simply by giving the appearance of a 'good guy'. His family life and line of work give him credibility, which makes it more difficult for the police to reveal his monstrous traits. In the series, Stella explains how the serial killer might seem like a charming person, but that this is just a strategy in order to hide his abnormal traits and behaviour. By doing this, he is categorised as 'normal' and manages to give the impression that he stays within the borders of society. This makes him a sort of invisible male monster who lurks on the margins of the normative and judicial borders, but stays well within society. He is an 'other' in disguise as a 'normal' human being.

The behaviour shown by Paul suggests that he has a split identity, where one part is apparently 'normal' and the other is 'abnormal'. The idea of the split self has often been a problem attributed to the modern human being. Because it has been an important idea in society, it has also been addressed in literature. One example of the split self can be found in one of the most famous stories in modern times, that is, Robert Louis Stevenson's *The*

Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde. This is a story that evolves around the respected Dr Jekyll who turns out to have a madness within him, which is kept in a place that cannot be seen, hidden from everyone around him. This madness is personified as Dr Jekyll walks around in the streets at night disguised as Mr Hyde, who violates and murders other people.

The most shocking thing about the story is that Dr Jekyll is a respected member of society, a person who no one would suspect to show such behaviour. When Dr Jekyll and his Mr Hyde are revealed to be the same person, society does not react by asking the question of how his personality has been split into two, but rather to get rid of Dr Jekyll. It does, however, appear that it is society, in which Dr Jekyll cannot get help for or reveal his problems, that is deceased, and instead of mending the problem within society, they just remove him.

This appears to be the case with Paul Spector as well. Due to the strict boundaries of society in which he lives, he is not able to tell people about his behaviour and ideas, as this would lead to him being categorised as 'abnormal' and 'other'. Just like Dr Jekyll, Paul has madness within him that he has to hide, and is able to control for a while. However, since he cannot reveal his abnormality he loses control of the other side of his personality, and this affects society as he starts violating and murdering women.

When Paul's monstrous actions are revealed, he is categorised as a criminal because his actions transgress the judicial rules of society. As stated, he is also described as an abnormal member of society, and this makes it possible to categorise him as 'other'. This categorisation turns out to be problematic, however, as he possesses many traits which those who are categorised as 'normal' show.

We have seen that many of the characters within *The Fall* are transgressive. They show signs of both normal and abnormal behaviour, and this is also the case with Stella. Even though there are many differences between the main characters, Stella and Paul, they are both individuals who transgress normative and judicial borders. As a result of this, one can perhaps argue that there are certain similarities between the pair of them. As shown above, this is hinted at in the series as well, and it is one of its more fascinating aspects. One of the things that links the two together is that they both can be seen as predators on the hunt for people in various ways.

Whereas it is easy to recognise Paul's behaviour as predatory, it is perhaps more difficult to spot the same trait when it comes to Stella. Still, it could be argued that she is just as much of a hunter as Paul and that she is also a person who stalks and hunts down other people. The easiest way to see Stella as a predator is through her job as a detective, whose job it is to find and hunt down human monsters such as Paul. This makes her a sort of 'official'

huntswoman, whose mission it is to catch the 'wolf' that lurks in the modern forests, and threatens to attack the young Red Riding Hoods of contemporary society.

The launch trailer the BBC made for the series exemplifies this well. In the beginning of the short video clip we get to see Paul who is all dressed in black, with blood on his hand, pulling up his black hood. He is apparently following Stella in the middle of the street, surrounded by a lot of people who do not pay any attention to him. The way it is filmed gives the impression that it is not only Paul who stalks her; it is also the viewer. We get to see how she is considered a potential victim, and that she is being hunted down.

However, the scene shifts so that it in the end we realize that it is Stella who stalks Paul. When the point of view changes a short text comes up, stating 'How do you catch a killer hidden in plain sight?' (BBC, 2013). This short trailer thereby emphasises how the modern monster, the serial killer, is able to walk among us without being detected. In addition to this, it shows how Paul and Stella are both hunters who stalk their prey in the midst of the urban city.

Another way to see Stella as a hunter is through her sexual behaviour. When she sees James Olson for the first time, she immediately asks the driver of the car she is in to stop, and commands her colleague to introduce them. She goes straight in for 'the kill' as she informs him that she will be staying for at least a week and gives him the room number and name of the hotel she stays at. After they have had sex, she expects him to leave straight away. When he tries to contact her later on, she informs him that she does not want anything more to do with him. This could imply that he is 'dead' to her, as she has managed to hunt him down and get her needs fulfilled. she has, in other words, no more need for him or his body.

A similar situation occurs when Stella meets Tom Anderson for the first time. Shortly after meeting him at a crime scene, she suggests that he should be appointed to her team. After a while, she manages to lure him to her hotel room, and they end up having sex. Once again, Stella proves that when the hunt is over and she has gotten her prey, she stops caring. In the final episode of season two, Tom and Paul, who are handcuffed together, get shot. One would think that the natural response is for Stella to run straight to the man she has had a relationship with, in order to help him. Stella, it turns out, does the exact opposite and runs straight to Paul and holds his head in her lap while screaming for an ambulance. Once again, it seems like her lover is 'dead' to her.

Both Paul and Stella's sexual behaviour suggests that they objectify people. After Paul has killed Sarah Kay he bathes her, paints her finger nails and poses her on the bed, making her look like a human mannequin. Stella's behaviour can be compared to his. Even though

she never kills someone, she still seems to look at men as objects who can be used and then tossed away, never to be used again. She appears to be just as much a predator as Paul, who hunts down victims, albeit in a different way.

Even though both Stella and Paul might be seen as hunters or predators, one can also argue that they are victims. As discussed earlier, women appear to be under constant threat of a male monster that hides in plain sight. This automatically makes Stella a potential victim. Whereas Paul only informs her that he is interested in her, it is her boss and former lover, Jim Burns, who performs the actual attack. The threat of the male monster thereby proves to be everywhere. It turns out that it is not only the individuals who are revealed as abnormal monsters who poses such a threat, but also the ones who are supposed to be normal and good.

In the series, Stella argues that Paul is an 'addict', a 'sexual psychopath' and claims that what he has '[i]s an addiction… like every other. It's an addiction that needs to be fed. It's an addiction that enslaves you' (The Fall, S02E06, 00:55:03-00:55:14). This suggests that Paul can be seen as a victim as well, that is, a victim of his own need to kill. The result of his addiction is that his freedom and relationships are taken away from him, and that he will not be able to fulfil his needs in the future.

This can be linked to what Foucault describes when he states that the medical fields have had an increased influence on our perception of monstrous criminals. He claims that this has resulted in a greater focus on the psychological state of the criminal, and that this has lead to inquiries of the mental state of the criminal, who will be 'assessed, appraised and measured in terms of the normal and the pathological'. This is done in order to find the reasons behind his/her criminal actions (Foucault 1975:93, 115). When Stella describes Paul's abnormal behaviour as an 'addiction', she is doing it by the use of medical terms, which further strengthens the belief that Foucault's claims are still relevant. In other words, we are trying to find a medical explanation for monstrous behaviour in modern society. This is perhaps done so that we can distance ourselves from the moral monsters, and categorise them as an 'other' who then becomes clearly separated from ourselves.

Even though Stella perhaps tries to distance herself from Paul by giving his actions a medical explanation, we recognise that they have certain features in common. Yet another thing Stella and Paul have in common is that they both have a 'double self', a topic that has been discussed earlier. They have aspects of their lives and personas that are kept hidden from the majority of the people they surround themselves with, as they are both showing behaviour that is considered abnormal by the rest of society. While Paul's life evolves around his binary roles as an 'everyman' and serial killer, Stella's dual life consists of her moral authority at

work and her 'abnormal' sexual life. This means that even though they transgress different borders, both show behaviour that is considered monstrous when revealed.

Through their roles as hunters and victims, Paul and Stella can be categorised as 'other'. Even though they seem to function well in everyday settings, their personalities also make them 'lone wolves' who are lurking on the margins of the normative and judicial borders of society. Both can be considered as monsters due to their transgressive behaviour, but the response their actions produce from society differs.

Just like Mr Hyde, Paul's actions are so monstrous that society cannot accept them, and feels that it needs to get rid of him. The response in regards to Stella's abnormal actions, however, is different. Even though she too transgresses borders, she is not put into prison for it. This means that even though she is somewhat punished, for example by the gossip that is written about her in the news papers, she manages to transgress the rules in a way that still makes her able to stay within the borders of society. This suggests that there are some actions, for instance adultery, that violates the normative and judicial rules in a way that enables society to accept them, while others, such as murder, are so monstrous that they cannot be tolerated at all.

This chapter has revealed that there are problems that arise when trying to identify the true monster within the Western society. The stereotypical male monster, the serial killer, is a character that frequently occurs in contemporary popular culture, but is being portrayed in a new way, that is as a wolf in disguise, an 'everyman' that hides in plain sight. Another important aspect about the modern male monster is that he is portrayed as having a complex psyche, and that the structure of society forces him to hide the more monstrous sides of his personality.

Since the male monster's main targets are young women, society often focuses on how these might be protected. In order to warn them about the dangers of the world, they are taught cautionary tales that emphasises how men are either good or bad, huntsmen or wolves. The problem with these, it turns out, is that they provide very rigid categories into which men and women need to conform. Women are either seen as too innocent and naïve, or not innocent enough, and therefore to blame if anything happens. In the end, the protection of women proves to be their own responsibility.

Even though the cautionary tales categorise men as either good or bad, they do however warn that every man has some features from the wolf within him. This makes the strict categorisation of men problematic as well, as they are not able to show their partly transgressive traits. The cautionary tales also suggests that because of their wolfish traits, men

cannot be blamed if they were to act on their instincts, which thereby puts the responsibility of protection on the women; they need to follow the advices and rules of society in order to stay safe.

3.5 Conclusion

The Fall shows us how these rigid categories causes problems for both men and women in the contemporary Western society. It illustrates how everyone has elements of the wolf, and that maybe the real problem lies with how men are positioned in relation to women. Because they all have parts of the wolf inside them, it seems that they are all likely to perform transgression in some sense, and this makes them more frightening as it makes all men a potential threat. Women, on the other hand, are seen as natural victims of rape; if they are there they can be raped, and it is their responsibility to take every precautions in order to prevent this from happening.

The TV-series shows how the serial killer Paul Spector violates and transgresses normative and judicial rules without being detected at first. It also shows how misogyny is present in the contemporary society, not just through Paul's actions, but also through comments made by other male characters. Paul is also not the only character who transgresses the boundaries, as many of the others crosses both the normative and judicial rules.

Stella is also a highly transgressive character, but she crosses the borders in a way that produce a different kind of reaction from society. Whereas Paul is being sent to prison for his actions, Stella receives almost no punishment at all. Her transgressions are linked to explicit sexuality, which is a kind of behaviour that is considered as deviant for women, but it is not conceived as so deviant that society needs to get rid of her. Both Stella and Paul can be considered as monsters, but there is an important difference between the two. Paul proves to be a monster because of the way he breaks both the normative and judicial rules through the killing of young women. Stella, on the other hand, is also a monster

The similarities between Stella and Paul evolves around them both being monsters and killers in their own way. Paul hunts down and physically murders young women, which is a clear violation of the rules of society. Stella, on the other hand, is also a hunter in the way that she hunts down and seduces men, and then considers them as 'dead' afterwards. There is however a significant difference between the two. Whereas Paul murders his victims, Stella

does not actually kill anyone in a juridical way. Still, she is a monster as well, in a moral sense, but this is a transgression that is accepted by society, unlike Paul's murders.

The Fall sheds light on how the serial killer can be seen as a modern version of the wolf found in the classical fairy tale "Little Red Riding Hood", which seduces and preys on women. The series also follows the narrative structure of fairy tales, or cautionary tales, as it provides a villain and a huntswoman. Another aspect about the series that follows the structure of cautionary tales is that the serial killer, Paul Spector, disturbs the balance within society by killing young women. Thereby it is the detective, Stella Gibson's, responsibility to restore the sense of equilibrium. All these notions suggest that the TV-series can be seen as a contemporary version of a cautionary tale, which aim is to warn the young women of the dangers that exist within modern Western society.

What is particularly interesting about *The Fall* is the fact that the individuals who are categorised as 'normal' by the rest of society, in fact prove to be transgressive. This is important, as it shows how everyone are capable of making transgressions, and are very likely to do so, even though this is a breech of the social pact. Another essential point in regards to this is that these transgressions are not always punished, but rather accepted or ignored. This is for instance the case with misogyny, which the series suggests is present among most men, to a certain extent.

The series illustrates how the different gender roles are perceived in Western society, and that it still portrays women as naïve victims who are responsible for their own misfortunes. However, the series also presents us with a main female character who goes against this norm. By having a profession that makes her authoritative and a sexuality that resembles that which is linked to men in Western society, Stella Gibson challenges stereotypes. Another part of the gender aspect the series comments on, is the roles of men. In cautionary tales, males are divided into two different roles; they are either heroes or villains. This also appears to be the case in contemporary narratives such as *The Fall*. This is for instance pointed out when one of the female characters states that she plans to warn her daughters against not only talking to strange men, but to any man. This is a consequence of the serial killer's ability to hide in plain sight, which forces women to start considering all men as a potential threat towards their safety.

As the analysis of *The Fall* has shown, everyone is capable of making transgressions as well as having moral issues, and this appears to be a part of being human. There is, however, a limit that is drawn at killing other people, which is something that cannot be accepted. We get the monsters we deserve, and the contemporary serial killer that is presented

in *The Fall* appears to function as a modern version of the 'wolf', and as a warning for young women about the dangers that exist within today's Western society.

The next chapter will continue to analyse the contemporary moral monster, but with a slightly different focus. It will examine the notion of the cannibalistic serial killer, and how this can be a critique of society. The aim is to examine whether the text *Hannibal* can be seen as a different kind of cautionary tale, where the monster itself functions as such a narrative. It will link the cannibal to the figure of the vampire to shed light on how these can be seen as a metaphor for society, and the immense influence consumerism has gained in contemporary Western society.

Chapter 4: To eat or get eaten

The taboo on cannibalism – on eating your own kind – offers the apparently unbreakable standard of propriety and hence ethics

(Warner 1998:139)

4.1 Introduction

Before continuing with this chapter about the TV-series *Hannibal* and cannibalism, let us stop and consider what has been discussed so far. We have seen that the monster is a character that embodies the anxieties that exist within a culture, and also helps us create the concepts of normality and otherness. As mentioned, Cohen (1996) supports the argument that the monster represents abominations against society, when he argues that it threatens to destroy both individuals as well as the cultural apparatus we use to create individuality. When he explains how the monster is an embodiment of the 'Outside' that we put at the liminal edges of the world, but which 'originate Within', he indicates that the monster is both familiar and strange (Cohen 1996:7). Even though the 'normal' individuals of a society wish to distance themselves from the moral monster, they still share certain traits with this monstrous character.

Warner (2010) further strengthens this view, when she claims that monsters have a 'double presence' as they originate from ourselves, but are at the same time 'perceived as alien, abominable and separate so that we can deny them' (Warner 2010:21). As discussed earlier, the new monsters presented in contemporary popular media, 'don't emanate from nature, but they're either men – or man-made'. These new kinds of monsters thereby prove not to be as alien as they used to be, but rather someone who is immediate to us and exist within the Western society. As Warner states, the 'new breed of monster' is not 'ultimately alien, but my brother, my self' (Warner 2010:21).

As mentioned earlier, Cohen argues that if an individual transgresses the normative and judicial borders of society, s/he risks becoming monstrous (Cohen 1996:12). The Western society is built on strict rules that restrict the sphere in which its members are allowed to function. As we have seen, these rules do not provide a lot of room for transgression, and

since everyone are likely to transgress some of the borders at some point of time, everyone risks becoming monsters.

Since all monsters are a result of the anxieties within society at any given time, the fear of becoming a monster could perhaps be seen as an anxiety in contemporary Western society. It could, then, be argued that this fear in fact makes the monster itself a cautionary tale. Through the body of the monster, society emphasises what behaviour and traits are seen as acceptable and unacceptable. Both Cohen and Warner describe how the word *monster* means 'that which reveals' or 'that which warns', and through the character of the monster, society warns its members that they risk becoming monstrous themselves if they cross its boundaries (Cohen 1996:4, Warner 2010:19).

The focus of this chapter is the American TV-series *Hannibal*, which evolves around the main characters Dr Hannibal Lecter (Mads Mikkelsen) and Will Graham (Hugh Dancy). Whereas Hannibal is a respected psychiatrist who turns out to be a cannibalistic serial killer, his patient Will shows extraordinary abilities to emphasise with serial killers. These qualities make the two of them fascinating to study, since they show a terrifying doubleness throughout the series. Although the Hannibal's double self is easy for the viewers to detect, Will turns out to be a problematic figure in the way that he has 'abnormal' abilities that makes him difficult to categorise.

By examining Hannibal and Will, the chapter seeks to investigate whether the series can present us with a different kind of cautionary tale. The main focus will be at the figure of the cannibalistic serial killer, and whether he can be seen as a critique of society. In order to do so, monster theory will once again be used in the analysis as to determine whether the figure of the cannibal can be seen as a sort of cautionary tale in itself. The cannibal will be linked to the notion of the vampire and provide a general discussion of the term *anthropophagy*, in order to provide a greater understanding of the notion. Through the analysis of *Hannibal*, the chapter will look into whether the cannibal can pose a threat not only to some individuals, but towards the entire human species.

Another aim of this chapter's analysis is to investigate the concept of cannibalism, or anthropophagy, and what makes this so problematic. It seeks to shed light on what the cannibalistic serial killer can tell us about society, and how he criticises this. The chapter will also discuss how the series sheds light on how knowledge influences monstrosity, and whether knowledge can make a person, and us viewers, complicit in monstrous actions. The chapter will also examine whether the cannibal and the vampire can be linked to consumerism, and this way be seen as a metaphor for society. Finally, this part of the thesis

will look at what happens when humans start eating other human beings, how society is affected by this.

4.2 The cannibal as a metaphor

One of the modern monsters that produces fear and creates anxiety within the contemporary Western society is the cannibal. In the OED *cannibalism* is defined as 'the practice of eating the flesh of one's own species' (Oxford English Dictionaries online, 2016). The cannibal is not a new figure, but has inhabited the margins of the world and its literature throughout history. In Western society, it was seen as a creature that existed in the exotic parts of the world, in countries 'far, far away' that only explorers visited. Consequently, it can be linked to the monsters that Alexa Wright (2013) writes about in her book *Monstrosity – The Human Monster in Visual Culture*, which were presented by Medieval Western travellers as creatures with hybrid bodies. At that time, all monsters were believed to only exist in exotic, foreign places, in the marginal parts of the world. Wright argues that 'extremes of climate and geography were believed to produce extremes bodies and behaviours', such as the monster (Wright 2013:16). By placing the monsters at the edges of the world, they were also placed outside 'the social and symbolic order of Western cultures'. Consequently, they were at a distance in which their transgressive traits did not pose a great threat towards Western society (Wright 2013:21).

In her book *Our cannibals, Ourselves*, Priscilla L. Walton (2004) describes how the monstrous cannibal was transformed into an active subject during the twentieth century. She argues that it has now become a discovering subject, which has shifted place from the margins of the world to the 'home space'. The cannibal has transformed from being a mythical creature to becoming more common, or as Walton states: 'where early killers were "over there," now they have shifted to "here" and even "next door"' (Walton 2004:121). This is an interesting change, as it moves the monstrous character from the margins of the world to within society. As a result of this, it suddenly becomes a greater threat towards the other members.

When the monsters relocated from the edges of the world to within Western society, they also transformed from 'them' to 'us', from outsiders to members of society. As Foucault argues, there was a change in detecting monstrousness from revealing it through physical

abnormality, to detecting monstrousness in the behaviour of the individuals who were considered abnormal. This makes the monster an even greater threat, since it made it an 'dangerous outsider' that manages to conceal its monstrousness.

Wright argues that there is an 'universal need to believe that criminal monsters […] are categorically different', but that this is problematic since the modern monster looks normal. The normal outward appearance makes it almost impossible to 'set a clear and tangible boundary between 'really' normal people and someone who has been identified as a criminal monster' (Wright 2013:155). The former tradition of recognising monsters through physical appearance is thereby worthless and cannot be used to identify it. This is also the case for abnormal persons such as the serial killer, and for the transgressive figure of the cannibal.

Whereas killing another human being is transgressive enough in itself, the cannibal manages to transgress the borders of society even further. Not eating human flesh is one of the most basic rules of Western society, and to violate this law is perhaps the most extreme transgression a human being can make. In the book *No Go the Bogeyman*, Marina Warner (1998) states that 'monsters, ogres and beasts who kill and eat human flesh […] represent abominations against society, civilization and family'. These characters, she argues, are used as means to explain what is considered acceptable and unacceptable behaviour within society, and what is seen as 'due order' (Warner 1998:11). This means that the cannibal shows traits that have been used to describe the moral monster, but transgresses the normative and judicial borders of society even more than other moral monsters.

The analysis in this chapter is based on the first two seasons of *Hannibal*, a TV-series set in contemporary America. As mentioned previously, it evolves around Dr Hannibal Lecter, a highly regarded psychiatrist and his patient, and his patient Will Graham, who has a unique ability to empathise with serial killers. Like the chapter on *The Fall*, the analysis evolves around the first two seasons of the series. These have been chosen in order to limit the analysis, but still provide enough material in order to thoroughly analyse the main characters.

There are several interesting characters in the series, where Hannibal Lecter and Will Graham are the most fascinating ones. Other characters such as Jack Crawford, Alana Bloom, Abigail Hobbs, and Bedelia Du Maurier will also be discussed, but these are flatter characters than the others, and are therefore not analysed as thoroughly as the three mentioned above. These can be seen as narrative tools in a way, in order to shed light on the more complex characters of Hannibal and Will, and will be analysed thereby.

Will Graham is one of the most interesting characters in *Hannibal*. Just like Hannibal, Will is headhunted by Jack Crawford, the head of Behavioural Science at the FBI, in order to help him catch serial killers. The reason why Will is a valuable asset to the FBI is the fact that he is able to 'see through the eyes' of serial killers and imagine what drives them to commit murders. This ability eventually makes the people around him start questioning him and his intentions, as they find him difficult to categorise. It also makes him an easy prey for Hannibal when he tries to make Will a scapegoat, in order to draw attention away from himself.

Another of the characters who is interesting to look at to gain a fuller understanding of Hannibal is his psychiatrist, Dr Bedelia Du Maurier. Except from Will, she is the only one who manages to detect Hannibal's monstrous traits at an early stage. From the very beginning of the series it is implied that she is an ambiguous character, who has secrets that Hannibal knows of and takes advantage of. These aspects makes her an interesting character to study, as she helps to shed light on Hannibal's abnormal traits, as well as revealing that other people in powerful positions also shows abnormal behaviour.

The reason why only a few of the characters in the series become suspicious towards Hannibal is because outward appearance is so normal. At first no one suspect him of any form of abnormality and he is even presented a highly respected member of society, someone who is regarded as both intelligent and attractive. This outward appearance does however soon turn out to be misleading since it hides the monstrous traits he possesses and acts on in disguise.

Whereas the other characters in the series have no idea that Hannibal is far from the person he gives the impression to be, the viewers get to see the other, monstrous sides of his hidden persona throughout the series. As it turns out, Hannibal is in fact a killer who not only commits a series of murders, but also eats his victims. He is thereby presented as a modern monster, a cannibalistic serial killer who is capable of concealing his abnormal, cannibalistic traits from the people closest to him.

The character of Hannibal Lecter has become a widely famous and popular one in Western society, and is one of many serial killers who have been presented in contemporary popular narratives. However, Hannibal brings yet another fascinating aspect to the table through his cannibalistic behaviour. Walton (2004) argues that Western cannibalism's commonness is 'particularly evident in the cannibalistic behaviour of serial killers, both historical and fictional' (Walton 2004:121).

This is portrayed in various narratives, for instance in media or popular literature, such as popular, contemporary TV-series like *Hannibal, The Walking Dead,* and *Game of Thrones*, which all include characters that show cannibalistic traits. One of the reasons for the frequent portrayal of the cannibal in narratives is its ability to combine the familiar and the strange. Walton even claims that the cannibal 'seems to be *the* signifier of both familiarity and strangeness' and that this capacity to resemble both fear and recognisable aspects enables it to make strange things seem familiar (Walton 2004:152).

This mixture of the familiar and the strange can be linked to Sigmund Freud's term 'the uncanny'. In *An Introduction to Literature, Criticism and Theory,* Bennett and Royle (2014) describe the uncanny as something that troubles definitions and fundamentally disturbs our thoughts and feelings. They argue that the uncanny disturbs the familiar, and can be described as 'a sense of unfamiliarity which appears at the very heart of the familiar' (Bennett and Royle 2014:35). Freud (1955) himself argues that the uncanny is 'in reality nothing new or alien, but something which is familiar and old-established in the mind and which has become alienated from it only though the process of repression' (Freud 1955:339-376). He further argues that this feeling is experienced 'in the highest degree in relation to death and dead bodies, to the return of the dead [...]' (Freud 1955:339-376).

Cohen (1996) argues that monsters never fully vanish, but rather transform in order to express the anxieties of the contemporary society. This could suggests that the fear of the cannibalistic serial killer who plagues contemporary society is a result of fears that has been repressed, but re-emerged in modern times. As a result, it also contains traits that appear to be familiar. The character of the vampire, which we will see is linked to the cannibal, is another example of a monster that has survived into the contemporary society.

The figure of the cannibal can be seen as a figure that is uncanny, as it shows traits that are both familiar and unfamiliar. On the one hand, the cannibal's apparently normal outward appearance makes it similar, and thus familiar, to the other 'normal' members of society. On the other hand, it embodies traits and shows behaviour that is highly transgressive, and therefore unfamiliar and strange. This combination makes the cannibal an alluring creature, which manages to both frighten and fascinate us.

The moral monster, or serial killer, is in other words uncanny because it seems human, but is really monstrous. As mentioned earlier, this aspect makes the moral monster abhuman. The familiarity we experience in relation to the monster is its human appearance, and this is the trait that enables it to hide in plain sight amongst 'normal' members of society. However,

when the moral monster shows signs of monstrousness, it suddenly becomes unfamiliar and is, as a result, perceived as uncanny.

The main character in *Hannibal,* Dr Hannibal Lecter is, as mentioned, a cannibalistic serial killer in disguise as a perfectly normal, respected person. The fact that he appears to be just as normal as anyone means that he has got traits that others recognise as familiar and safe. Still, he also embodies traits that are strange and frightening, although not easy to reveal. This means that Hannibal is a character that proves to be both uncanny and abhuman. One of the most fascinating consequences of this is that Hannibal's apparent normality makes it possible for him to serve human flesh to others without it being revealed. Walton (2004) claims that Hannibal is 'an intriguing illustration of anthropophagy because he is urbane, sexually ambiguous, and extremely dangerous' (Walton 2004:128). In other words, he manages to show behaviour and embody traits that are normal and abnormal, fascinating and frightening, and this makes him a great threat towards other members of society.

The term *anthropophagy* is defined by the OED as 'the eating of human flesh by other people' (Oxford English Dictionaries online, 2016). According to the Encyclopædia Britannica (2016) the term derives from the Spanish word 'Caríbales' or 'Caníbales', describing a tribe called the Carib from the West Indies that was known for practicing cannibalism (Encyclopedia Britannica online, 2016). It further describes how the act of cannibalism can have different underlying reasons. In some cases the human flesh has been considered as food, while it in other cases has been ingested as a part of a ritual. For instance, 'headhunting' was linked to some tribes in Africa, who ingested parts of the body or head of enemies in order to absorb their beneficial traits, and reduce the chance for revenge.

On other occasions cannibalism has merely been a necessity in order to survive, which was for instance the case when a plane of rugby players from Uruguay crashed in the Andes in 1972. In order to stay alive, the survivors had to eat parts of the bodies of their deceased friends. What is particularly interesting about this is that after the incident was reported, Western society did not exclude the surviving members, even though they had broken the social pact by eating human flesh. This can suggests that in some cases, such as when it is a matter of life and death, the rules that forbid anthropophagy do not apply within Western society either.

The practice of eating meat is a familiar and normal action for most human beings, but when the flesh comes from other human beings, the act suddenly becomes uncanny. Like Bennett and Royle argued, the uncanny disturbs the familiar and troubles our definitions, and this is also the case with anthropophagy. Even though human flesh can be categorised as

meat, it is still considered as an illegal kind of meat that one should never consume. What makes the main character in *Hannibal* particularly interesting as an image of anthropophagy is his normal outward appearance. He is a character that no one would suspect would show such abnormal behaviour, and this is what makes him so dangerous.

By embodying these traits, as well as having an apparently 'normal' outward appearance, Hannibal is a character that combines the familiar and the strange (Walton 2004:128). In the series, Hannibal is presented as a Byronic hero; an alluring character that is also extremely dangerous. He is portrayed as a highly respected member of society who is very attractive, but also very threatening. He is good-looking, intelligent, well spoken, and well educated, with great abilities in areas such as cooking. All of which are aspects that make him enticing for other, more normal members of society who are drawn towards him. Cohen also supports the view of the monster as both alluring and dangerous when he argues that the monstrous exist in the 'primal space between fear and attraction' (Cohen 1996:19).

Hannibal is similar to the vampire who is so attractive that he appears to be 'larger than life'. His appearance makes him seem unnaturally perfect, which is also one of the main features of the Byronic heroes and vampires that hide within contemporary society. Another aspect Hannibal shares with the vampire is the fact that he is extremely dangerous for other human beings. The threat of being consumed is always present for the people Hannibal surround himself with, but they do not detect this.

Since the Byronic hero is so attractive and pretty, one is capable of forgetting that he is a person, and can as a result start perceiving him as an object instead of a human being. Humans are often drawn towards pretty things and this can be linked to the consumerist society in which we live, where materialistic values are the core ones. In order to gain access to and to surround oneself with the attractive Byronic hero, one might end up ignoring any abnormal traits they might try to hide. Consequently, one becomes an easy prey due to innocence and the fact that one is naïve. The reason why the Byronic hero and the vampire are so dangerous is because they are able to befriend their victims. Similar to the wolf in "Little Red Riding Hood" they use their seductive charm in order to get close to their victims before they try to kill them, and this is what makes them such a big threat towards other people. Since we cannot recognise the abnormal traits of the Byronic hero or the vampire, we risk to unknowingly give these monsters a way into our lives, which can prove to be a fatal decision.

Hannibal is a good example of this, since he is so attractive that the people who surround him are not able to see the tell-signs of his abnormal behaviour and traits. His charm and cunning behaviour enables him to perform and get away with cannibalistic acts and

continue to murder people, under the disguise of being a 'perfect gentleman'. He uses his charming manners in order to seduce the people he surrounds himself with, and gains their trust. Because of his way of being as well as his highly regarded profession, he is able to get close to his victims, who he either murders or make complicit in his monstrous actions.

As described above, consumerism and capitalism hold important roles in Western society. However, these prove to be problematic since they challenge our ethical values. We have seen that monsters are embodiments of the anxieties that exist within the contemporary society, and as a result of this, the cannibal can be seen as a modern monster. This figure can be seen as a comment on the hypocrisy that exists within Western society when it comes to consumerism and food. Whereas some practises related to the production and consumption of food are seen as 'illegal' because of their barbarity, others, who may prove to be just as amoral, are allowed.

The subject of food and consumerism is central when it comes to some modern monsters, and the cannibal is in many ways similar to undead creatures like the zombie and the vampire, who all feed on other people. Warner argues that these 'form part of the larger family of fatal monsters who cannibalize humans' (Warner 1998:13). She further claims that 'food – procuring it, preparing it, cooking it, eating it – dominates the material as the overriding image of survival; consuming it offers contradictory metaphors of life and civilization as well as barbarity and extinction' (Warner 1998:13). We need food in order to survive, but the rules of society restrict what kind of food is appropriate to eat.

The social pact that Western society is founded on is created in order to protect its members, as well as secure a sense of stability within society. The prohibition that states that one is not allowed to eat the flesh of another human being is one of the core rules of this social pact. If humans were to eat other humans, it would most likely lead to the extinction of the species. In addition to this, eating other humans denies the value of others as spiritual beings, as they would only be considered a pure object of one's own survival. This would eventually lead to the end of civilization on all levels.

4.2.1   The 'vampiric capitalism'

In the chapter "Aftergothic: consumption, machines, and black holes" in *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*, Fred Botting (2002) links the character of the vampire to Western consumerism and its 'patterns of consumption'. Like monsters in general it functions as a marginal creature, especially on 'the borders between life and death, between human,

animal and supernatural identities'. The vampire blurs the lines between what is familiar and unfamiliar, home and foreignness, and is a creature that exist on both the inside and outside of society. Where it is placed is not the only aspect that is interesting; what it does is just as important. Botting further explains how the vampire is 'consuming bodies, it transforms beings, contaminating them with its own appetites and desires' (Botting 2002:288).

Karl Marx used the vampire as a metaphor in order to explain the connection between human lives and consumerism. He suggested that 'human life is turned into dead labour to feed the insatiable machine of capitalist production', a 'horrifying transformation' which becomes the norm in the twentieth century. Furthermore, Marx claims that the 'vampiric capitalism' that has become the core structure of Western society was created when production had to give up to capitalism. All humans transformed from being 'simply the victims of the wage slaves of vampiric capitalism to […] willing participants' (Botting 2002:288). By linking vampires to the capitalistic structure of Western society, it is implied that the consumerism that surrounds people also 'eats them up' in a way.

In the capitalistic Western society, the rhetoric of the cannibal and the vampire has been used as a tool in order to 'shape conceptions of the body' (Walton 2004:6). The cannibalistic monster might symbolise the threat postmodern capitalism poses towards humans, through its massive need for human lives and work force. In other words, our bodies may not be our own anymore, as they have become a product that can be consumed. This means that we face being consumed not only by the human cannibal, but also the cannibalistic economical system in the Western world.

Walton (2004) argues that vampires are parasites that show cannibalistic behaviour by absorbing blood from their victims (Walton 2004:72). As the vampire is a monster that embodies anxieties within society, it can be argued that cannibals and the 'vampiric capitalism' are aspects of Western society that the members fear will consume them. One area of capitalism that is particularly linked to the human body and the violation of this, is organ harvesting. This can be considered a new kind of cannibalism, as it involves the removal of an organ from one human being, which is then 'incorporated into and consumed by another in order for the recipient to live' (Walton 1998:136-137).

The concept of organ harvesting raises several questions about aspects such as prioritisation, supply and demand, and whether the organs are removed before the donor has 'expired'. Walton argues that 'questions such as these engender hysteria about black market body-snatchers who sell organs to the highest bidders' (Walton 1998:136-137). Thereby, the

concept of cannibalism becomes more immediate, as the need for organ donation might become relevant for everyone.

Organ harvesting is also addressed in *Hannibal,* as Will and the other FBI agents are called out to a crime scene where the killer has buried victims who are brain-dead, but physically alive. The killer has supplied them with intravenous fluids to keep them alive, so that he could 'harvest' their organs later. He does this in order to keep the meat and organs 'fresh' when he is to eat the different parts of the victims.

By portraying such a killer, the series depicts a kind of monster that views other human beings as pure objects, rather than spiritual beings. The fact that humans are spiritual beings is one of the main values and beliefs in Western society, as it separates us from other animals. The human being has value because of its ability to think rationally and to have an awareness of itself, as this is what makes it more than just a physical being. In this sense, it could be argued that the series questions what it is to be a human being, and how we use the social pact and its implicit and explicit rules in order to determine this.

This distinction between animals that are considered spiritual beings and those that are not, can function as a useful device in order to separate what kind of animal flesh we are allowed to eat. It makes society capable of establishing rules that prevent the human species from extinction, as it denies its members to eat each other. Also, we need to de-spiritualise animals in order to eat them without feeling amoral. This means that if society allows us to ear certain kinds of meat, we can do so without feeling bad about it or be perceived as unethical.

4.2.2   Cannibalism and the problem of meat

When the cannibal eats other human beings it can be argued that he considers them as objects, rather than spiritual beings that have a right to decide over their own bodies. This can perhaps be linked to the rest of society as well, and how our focus on consumerism has influenced the way we view other people. As we have seen, contemporary Western society is a materialistic one where everything, in theory, has a price and can be bought. This even goes for parts of the human body, which can be purchased by people who need them and have enough money. In other words, we live in a culture where human bodies are seen as products, and that these consist of individual parts one can purchase if one has enough capital. The cannibal shares this perception of the human body as a product, and can therefore be seen as a good embodiment of the fear that exists within society in regards to this. Its disrespect for humans

as spiritual beings can shed light on what might happen, if the trend of objectifying human bodies is allowed to continue to evolve within the Western society.

As we have seen, Warner states that 'the taboo on cannibalism – on eating your own kind – offers the apparently unbreakable standard of propriety and hence ethics' (Warner 1998:139). The human species is one of few that do not have many natural threats that might lead to its extinction. In fact, the biggest threat towards mankind seems to be people who prey on and kill other humans. One of the ways society tries to prevent this from happening is through the construction of rules that forbid these kinds of actions. By categorising some types of food as either acceptable or illegal, society also emphasises which norms and rules one needs to follow to be considered a part of the civilised society.

Similar to those in *The Fall*, the characters in *Hannibal* break the normative and judicial rules to some extent. As mentioned, all humans transgress the borders to some extent, and since this is one of the main characteristics of the modern monster, it makes everyone potential monsters in a way. Still, we have seen that not all transgressions are so serious that they are considered monstrous. Another thing that might prevent a person who has breeched the rules from being labelled a monster, is if s/he did not know the action were wrong. There is, in other words, a difference between knowing and not knowing that what one is doing is wrong in terms of behaviour that can be seen as monstrous.

Throughout *Hannibal* there are constant hints about how Hannibal is a serial killer who uses human flesh when cooking dinner for his friends. What is particularly fascinating about Hannibal's cannibalism is that he manages to include his friends in his abnormal behaviour. By throwing dinner parties for his friends, he is able to serve them human flesh without them knowing or suspecting anything. The way Hannibal manages to lure his friends in such a way suggests that there is a possibility that everyone could be able to perform similar actions, and thereby break the social pact, without knowing it.

Not eating human flesh is one of the most fundamental rules of the social pact and by breaking it one instantly becomes monstrous. Still, one might be breach the borders of society without knowing it, and this is the case of many for many of the characters in *Hannibal*. To breach a normative or judicial border without knowing it is a frightening idea. The way Hannibal serves human flesh to others without telling them suggests that this is something that could happen to everyone. This means that one might be monstrous without even being aware of it.

When Hannibal serves dishes made of human flesh, his guests are unaware that they are violating the rules of society. They can therefore be seen as innocent victims, which

makes Hannibal's acts even more monstrous. He is tricking others to transgress rules without their knowledge and manages to include others in his monstrous behaviour by making them trust him. He is aware that what he is doing is wrong and a breech of the social pact, but still proceeds with it and even includes others. Because they are unaware of what they are doing, Hannibal includes them without giving them a choice to decide whether they want to be a part of it or not.

There is one conversation in *Hannibal* that illustrates an intriguing aspect of the social pact that holds the Western society together, namely the notion of unethical, amoral, or 'illegal', types of food. This is exemplified when Hannibal has invited Jack Crawford and his wife, Bella, over for dinner, and serves them the French dish foie gras:

Jack Crawford:	"Mmm. Cold foie gras with warm figs"
Hannibal Lecter:	"Yes"
Jack Crawford:	"Very nice"
Bella Crawford:	"Would I be a horrible guest if I skipped this dish?"
Hannibal Lecter:	"Too rich?"
Bella Crawford:	"Too cruel"
Jack Crawford:	"Phyllis"
Bella Crawford:	"Jack"
Hannibal Lecter:	"The first and worst sign of sociopathic behaviour. Cruelty towards animals"
Jack Crawford:	"That doesn't apply in the kitchen"
Hannibal Lecter:	"I have no taste for animal cruelty. Which is why I employ an ethical butcher"

(Hannibal, S01E05, 00:10:10-00:10:38)[4]

This conversation contains several interesting aspects about the thought pattern of the contributing individuals, but also society as a whole, in regards to food and norms. The dish Hannibal serves, foie gras, is by many considered to be a delicacy. Others, like Bella, do however believe it is unethical to eat the dish, because it is a result of geese being force-fed. This emphasises that the norms related to food might differ greatly, even within a small group

---

[4] All quotes from *Hannibal* used in this thesis are my transcriptions

such as the one in the scene. Whereas some believe it is perfectly appropriate to eat it, others believe it should be deemed illegal.

It could perhaps be argued that the scene says something about the food industry in general, and that it is a critique of consumerism. One of the problems linked to this is that we want cheap or luxurious meat, and in order to get this we are willing to treat animals like object rather than living beings. This is problematic since it sheds light on how we are willing to commit violent actions, or ignore such actions made by others, in order to make a profit. The discussion in this scene could suggest that the series is, in its own way, a critique of contemporary society.

The process of making foie gras sheds light on an important, and perhaps hypocritical, aspect of the norms that surrounds food in Western society. It exemplifies how it is accepted to torture and kill animals in order to make a high-status dish, while it is illegal to cook food with human flesh. Warner (1998) states that food is the 'overriding image of survival; consuming it offers contradictory metaphors of life and civilization as well as barbarity and extinction' (Warner 1998:13). This suggests that even though we need food in order to survive, particular kinds of food could also represent barbarity, for instance through the process by which it is obtained.

The hypocrisy norms regarding food does is not only restricted to foie gras. The entire meat industry in the capitalistic Western society is problematic, as it's main goal is to produce as much as possible, for the lowest cost possible. In his book *Eating Animals*, Jonathan Safran Foer (2009) describes how this focus on productivity often affects the welfare of the animals used to provide food. He points out that such factory farming of animals 'reduce[s] production costs to the absolute minimum and systematically ignore[s] or "externalize[s]" such costs as environmental degradation, human disease, and animal suffering' (Foer 2009:34).

Foer uses the popular fast food chain *Kentucky Fried Chicken* (KFC) as an example of how the food industry is willing to treat the animals badly in order to provide cheap meat. Even though 'KFC insists it is "committed to the well-being and humane treatment of chickens"', animal torturing has still been revealed at the slaughterhouse that is one of their main suppliers (Foer 2009:67). In this slaughterhouse, which was rewarded as the "Supplier of the Year", 'workers were documented tearing the heads off live birds, spitting tobacco into their eyes, spray-painting their faces, and violently stomping on them' (Foer 2009:67).

Even though incidents like these have been revealed time after time, the popularity of KFC and other fast food chains does not seem to be harmed. This emphasises one of the core

problems within the capitalistic Western society, namely the fact that we are willing to ignore torture of animals if it means that we are provided cheap meat. It shows how we consider and treat animals as objects, rather than living beings. Like Hannibal points out, one of the first signs socio- and psychopaths show is animal cruelty. Therefore it could perhaps be argued that everyone who ignores the torture of animals in order to produce cheap meat also shows signs of psychopathy. It could perhaps be argued that the series, through the foie gras scene, criticises the hypocritical perception of meat production within Western society.

The idea that there are certain types of meat that are deemed unethical to eat is supported, yet questioned by Foer. He relates this to the taboo of eating dogs in Western society, and tries to establish why it is worse to eat one kind of animal meat while it is accepted to eat other kinds. He states that 'despite the fact that it's perfectly legal in forty-four states, eating "man's best friend" is as taboo as a man eating his best friend', and argues that the fact that we do not eat dog meat says a lot about society in general (Foer 2009:24). Some of the arguments used for not having dogs on the menu, is that one shouldn't eat 'animals with significant mental abilities' (Foer 2009:26). If dogs are included in this category, animals such as pigs, chickens and cows will also have to be included and cannot therefore be considered 'ethical' meat (Foer 2009:25-26).

As we have seen, eating dogs and other human beings are considered taboos in Western society. In the OED a *taboo* is defined as 'a social or religious custom prohibiting or restricting a particular practice or forbidding association with a particular person, place or thing' (Oxford English Dictionaries online, 2016). These taboos do, however, not necessarily have a logical explanation. Foer argues that *'it's for good reason that the eternal taboos – don't fiddle with your shit, kiss your sister, or eat your companions – are taboo. Evolutionary speaking, those things are bad for us'.* (Foer 2009:26) Still, eating meat that originates from dogs, or humans, does not provide any danger if it is properly cooked, and this emphasises how the illegal aspect of these types of meat is constructed by society.

The fact that Hannibal manages to trick people into believing they are served animal meat, not human flesh, emphasises that there is no natural or obvious distinction between the two. They all seem to enjoy his cooking, and this suggests that if human flesh is prepared and cooked the same way animal meat is, one might not taste the difference. This problematizes the aspect of cannibalism further, as it suggests that we do not eat human flesh because it tastes bad, but because it has been presented by society as taboo. It is considered an abnormal, and thereby illegal, act.

What makes eating human flesh a taboo is the fact that it is considered abject. In the book *Power of Horror*, Julia Kristeva (1982) discusses the idea of the abject. She argues that it is something that 'cannot be assimilated', something that is 'opposed to *I*' (Kristeva 1982:1). She argues that one cannot separate oneself completely from what is abject, and therefore one cannot protect oneself from it either, as apposed to the way one can from objects. It is something that 'does not respect borders, positions, rules' which is ambiguous and in-between, such as 'the criminal with good conscience, the shameless rapist, the killer who claims he is a survivor' (Kristeva 1982:4).

What is abject is unwanted, and in order to avoid this we create rules everyone needs to follow. John Lechte (2003) describes how the abject denies such a creation of borders, and it is therefore uncomfortable for us to experience (Lechte 2003:10). Prohibition and transgression are linked to abjection, and this is further tied to the function of taboos. When we are in contact with this we feel revulsion and abjection and this 'keeps taboos in place' (Lechte 2003:10-11). A taboo can be seen as a sort of normative law that explains what behaviour is accepted and what is not, and consequently it is a part of the social pact that binds society together.

The way we control and protect ourselves from abjection is, in other words, through the construction of rules such as penal laws. Crime is abject, especially the premeditated kind, since it sheds light on the fragility of the law society has created (Kristeva 1982:4). As Foucault argued, we need rules in order for a society to function and this is why there is a social pact that all members need to follow in order to stay within society. Laws and rules are therefore a crucial aspect of any society, and we need to stick to these in order for society not to collapse.

This is also the reason to why we have rules that regulates which kinds of food is allowed and prohibited to consume. Kristeva argues that food can become abject if it 'is a border between two distinct entities or territories. A boundary between nature and culture, between the human and the non-human' (Kristeva 1982:75). When an individual has a dislike for a certain type of food it is based on affect rather than reason, and has an abject basis. Lechte (2003) states that 'feelings of horror can be evoked in purification rituals', and this is exemplified through the rule the Jews have against eating pork, and the fact that Muslims require halal food (Lechte 2003:10).

The feeling of abjection is also one of the reasons why we have rules against anthropophagy. Human meat is an uncanny abject in the sense that it is something that is familiar, but also something different. If one is able to recognise things as an object one has

71

the possibility to construct meaning and see the world in a different way, which is positive. However, if the abject feeling is too intense it will lead to psychosis, and Kristeva argues that the abject is able to draw one 'toward the place where meaning collapses' (Kristeva 1982:2). If we do not know that the meat we eat is from a human being, we treat it as an object. If we are aware that it comes from another person, however, the abject feeling becomes too intense and could lead to a psychosis.

What is interesting about the abject aspect about human meat, is that some people ignores the taboos surrounding this, and ingest it as an object, the same way others view animal meat. Since the individual has then broken the social pact, he is deviant, a monster. The monster is the one who knows it is wrong, and still eats it. He does not experience the intense feeling of abjection that other people do, and this signalises that anthropophagy can only be the act of a 'mad man'.

This is what makes the cannibalistic traits of Hannibal so intriguing, as he does not seem to view human flesh as abject, but rather an object. Since his friends are not aware they are being served human flesh, they too consider it an object. This lack of knowledge removes the feeling of abjection, and makes them eat the meals. The fact that Hannibal knows and still eats it therefore makes him a monster. He transgresses the rules, which is abject in itself, and does not seem to be destabilised by this, which suggests that he is beyond it in some sense. He lives in a world where there is no problems regarding cannibalism, and since he does not conform to the rules he immediately transforms to an abject, uncanny monster.

4.5.   The issue of knowledge

As we have seen, the threat of the immediate cannibalistic monster is a theme that runs through *Hannibal*. Just like Paul Spector, Hannibal Lector is a serial killer who manages to hide in plain sight. He too has an outward appearance that enables him to perform abnormal, monstrous actions without being revealed. He is in other words a wolf in disguise, which preys on other humans. However, whereas Paul's monstrous acts stops after he has killed his victims, Hannibal transgresses the borders even further by removing and ingesting their organs as well.

In other words, Hannibal, like Paul, is a serial killer who lives 'next door'. He is a psychiatrist who helps the FBI when they need to profile killers, and his profession provides him with an outward behaviour that appears to be normal. It enables him to hide his

abnormality, especially his cannibalistic behaviour. Because no one suspects him of being a cannibal, they do not even consider the possibility that he is serving them is human flesh. At some occasions he even hints about what he is serving, but no one ever makes the link. One of the times this happens, is when Jack Crawford is invited over for dinner:

Jack Crawford:	"What am I about to put in my mouth?"
Hannibal Lecter:	"Rabbit"
Jack Crawford:	"He should've hopped faster"
Hannibal Lecter:	"Yes, he should have. But fortunately for us, he didn't"

(Hannibal, S01E04, 00:15:30-00:15:42)

For Jack, this conversation might seem innocent enough, but while they are talking, the viewers get to see how Hannibal obtained the meat he has used in the meal. There are short glimpses that show a man falling down while running in the woods, followed by scenes where Hannibal is preparing the meat and cooking the meal. By presenting the scenes from the forest and the kitchen, the series implies that Hannibal has used human flesh as the main ingredient in the dish. Throughout the series there are frequently similar scenes that suggest that he has abnormal eating habits.

Another interesting aspect about the cannibal in this series is that he functions as a vampire. Like the vampire, he befriends his victims and makes them let him into their lives, without them knowing about the danger he presents. Similar to the monsters, we get the vampires we deserve. Nina Auerbach (1995) argues that the vampire is a parasite who is 'drinking our lives in secrecy' (Auerbach 1995:1). She further states that even though the figure of the vampire 'stretch back through folklore to the beginnings of recorded history', it became an important literary figure in 1816, as a result of Lord Byron's influence on literature (Auerbach 1995:1). Both the vampires from the nineteenth century and the ones today are described as 'enchanting companions; […] media stars' (Auerbach 1995:1).

Another aspect the vampire shares with the monster is the ability to change in order to address issues that are relevant in contemporary society. They are able to blend in and hide among us, and Auerbach argues that they 'inhere our most intimate relationships' and are 'hideous invaders of the normal' (Auerbach 1995:6). In the preface of the book *Dracula*, edited by Nina Auerbach and David J. Skal (1997), they argue that Dracula, one of the most famous characters in modern literacy, 'is a monster only to those who know him' (Auerbach

and Skal 1997:ix). Unlike the Mr Hyde, who most people do not want to get involved with, Dracula blends into the contemporary society in a way that makes no one believe he is monstrous. He is 'a vampire with the potential to be at home everywhere' and this enables him to hide in plain sight among the normal members of society (Auerbach and Skal 1997:ix).

In order for Dracula to gain access to people's homes, he has to be invited in. This is similar to the way Hannibal gains access to people's lives, namely by them inviting him in. This puts him in a position that enables him to manipulate them, and thereby prey on their kindness and good will. It is, however, not only the persons close to him he persuades to let him have access, this is also the case for us viewers. By watching or reading narratives in which he is present, we invite him into our lives and let him persuade us. He thereby manages to make us complicit in his abnormal, monstrous actions as we gain knowledge about his monstrosity.

The aspect of knowledge is important when it comes to *Hannibal* and the main character's eating habits. Even though Hannibal knows that his actions are wrong, he still proceeds with them. He even transgresses the rules of society further by manipulating others into making the same transgressions as he does, unknowingly. Another important aspect is that the viewers share this knowledge, since we get to see how Hannibal obtains and prepares the food he serves to others. We know that Hannibal's actions are wrong, but we still find them so fascinating that we continue to watch. This makes us complicit in a way, and does perhaps also make us monsters too. Another time we have more knowledge than the participants in the scene, is when he is eating dinner with his colleagues Alana Bloom and Frederick Chilton:

Alana Bloom:	"I don't think I've ever had tongue before"
Hannibal Lecter:	"It was a particularly chatty lamb"
[Frederick Chilton laughs]	
Alana Bloom:	"Smells delicious"
Frederick Chilton:	"The Romans used to kill flamingos just to eat their tongues"
Hannibal Lecter:	"Don't give me ideas. Your tongue is very feisty. And as this evening has already proven, it's nice to have an old friend for dinner"

(Hannibal, S01E06, 00:15:30-00:15:42)

Even though he never explicitly states that the lamb is in fact a human being, the viewers know enough to interpret it that way, especially as Hannibal describes his victim as being 'very chatty'. His threat towards Frederick might seem as a joke, but knowing that they are speaking to a serial killer who eats other humans, the threat suddenly seems very real. Still, as Hannibal is able to hide his true identity from the people around him, no one takes it seriously. The last comment also suggests that Hannibal has eaten 'an old friend' before, which makes the threat seem even worse and more likely to be serious.

Once again, the viewers have more knowledge about the true meanings behind what Hannibal says and the monstrousness of his actions, and can perhaps be seen as accomplice in a sense. This involvement makes the viewers feel uncomfortable and a bit paranoid, since everything he says can be interpreted in several ways. The things he says and does appear to be normal, or familiar enough, but the knowledge the viewers possess makes his statements strange and unfamiliar as well. Thereby, the whole series becomes uncanny, as it presents actions and dialogue that are apparently familiar while it at the same time adds a strange and frightening layer.

Still, we continue to watch the series. A reason to this could be the fact that Hannibal is a monster, which we tend to find both fascinating and frightening. Cohen (1996) argues that the monster can be a site for 'escapist fantasies', where we can explore forbidden practices. In a liminal and delimited space, the monstrous body, we are allowed to examine 'fantasies of aggression, domination and inversion' (Cohen 1996:17). He further argues that one of the core traits of the monster is its ability to both make us detest it and feel attracted to it, and that this is what has ensured its continued popularity (Cohen 1996:17). This is perhaps also why we enjoy watching Hannibal commit monstrous actions, even though it makes us complicit and monstrous.

Hannibal's seductive traits are what make it possible for him to manipulate the people he surrounds himself with. These features appear to be similar to the wolves Perrault describes in the 'moral' epilogue of his version of "Little Red Riding Hood". In this, he warns that the most frightening wolves might be the ones that no one suspects, which have the ability to deceive. The wolves are alluring creatures, and it is therefore easy to be so fascinated and attracted to them that one might not notice their abnormal traits. The 'moral' part of "Little Red Riding Hood" emphasises the theory that wolves might hide everywhere, be everyone, and that young women in particular need to be aware of this danger that hides within society.

Hannibal is a charming, seductive serial killer that hunts down his prey, similar to Paul Spector in *The Fall*. They can both be said to function as modern male monsters that share many of the traits of the wolf in "Little Red Riding Hood". For a long time they are able to hide in plain sight, and to transgress the borders of society without anyone noticing. As shown earlier in the thesis, contemporary narratives about serial killers share many of the features of older cautionary tales. One of these is the description of the wolves, or monsters, which the young girls and other potential victims need to be aware of. This is also the case in *Hannibal*, which is a TV-series that contains characters that can be perceived as wolves, hunters and victims.

Whereas *The Fall* appears to be more of a traditional cautionary tale in a modern form, it can be argued that *Hannibal* deviates somewhat from the older stories. The series does not appear to have a structure in which there is a clear distinction between the 'good' and 'bad' characters. It is rather a tale in which the main focus is the 'wolf' and his ability to seduce and manipulate his victims in an extreme way. The point of this is to cause terror, and a way the series manages to produce such a feeling is because it makes the 'wolf' befriend the 'Red Riding Hoods' of the story. The different serial killers and 'wolves' in *Hannibal* are often able to make the victims trust them, which makes it easier to hunt them down.

Two of the characters who use this strategy in order to hunt down their prey is Abigail Hobbs and her father, Jacob Garrett Hobbs. What is interesting about Abigail is the fact that she is presented as a victim of her father's monstrous actions for a long time, before it is revealed that she has helped him. Eventually, Abigail admits her participation in her father's monstrous, transgressive actions, and is suddenly transformed from being a victim to being a hunter. She tells Hannibal all about how she assisted her father by initiating conversations with the young women in order to retrieve information about them and their schedule. By taking advantage of the young women's naïve innocence, Abigail is able to gain enough information about them for her father to hunt them down later. Since she uses her appearance as a normal young girl in order to befriend the young girls who later become victims of her father, Abigail turns out to be a kind of vampire too. She preys on the kindness and good will of other people, which in the end leads to their deaths.

This kind of seductive behaviour can also be linked to the wolf in "Little Red Riding Hood", who uses his charm in order to deceive the young girl. This points to an interesting aspect about the themes of complicity and knowledge that run through the series. Whereas those who eat Hannibal's meals made of human flesh can be seen as complicit in the monstrous act, they are still unaware of what they are doing. As long as the viewers do not

have knowledge of Abigail's involvement in her father's killings, we see her as innocent. However, when her actions are revealed, we get to know that she is complicit after all. This proves how problematic it is to categorise people, since individuals who appears to be innocent could actually turn out to be manipulative and monstrous after all.

Even though Abigail has participated in her father's monstrous actions, and kills a man in self-defence, one still gets the feeling that she is mainly a victim. When she tells her story to Hannibal, she emphasises how her father had implied that he would kill her if she did not help him hunt down the other women. Thereby, her actions appear to be a sort of self-defence, as she had the choice between helping her father murder other girls, or get murdered herself. Her innocence seems to be her downfall in the final episode of season two, when she ends up trying to kill Alana Bloom, after Hannibal has persuaded her to do it. The ambiguous character of Abigail proves to be problematic, since the viewers feel both sympathy and repulsion towards her and her actions. She is uncanny in a way, as she appears to be familiar and normal, but also embodies traits that are highly abnormal.

Alana Bloom is one of the characters in *Hannibal* that helps exemplifying how the male monster manages to perform monstrous actions through the use of charm. Like Will and Hannibal, she helps the FBI as a consultant in murder cases, as she too is a psychiatrist. Alana is a good example of how Hannibal manages to trick the people he surrounds himself with, as she does not suspect him of being a cannibalistic monster. Like Little Red Riding Hood, Alana is too innocent in the way that the 'wolf', or Hannibal, easily manipulates her. Since she is convinced Hannibal is not able to perform the monstrous actions of cannibalism and murder, she ignores the warning signs and 'follows the wolf further into the woods'. She becomes a victim of the vampire-like traits of Hannibal, who preys on other people's kindness and good will.

When Will tries to convince her that Hannibal is the 'Chesapeake Ripper', she turns out to be more likely to believe Hannibal than him. Whereas Will shows behaviour and traits that are difficult to categorise, Hannibal has seduced her in a way that makes her unable to see him as a monster. When Will is released from prison after being officially cleared of all charges in relation to the actions of the 'Chesapeake Ripper', Alana meets him at his house. This leads to a discussion about their conflicting views of Hannibal, and of her safety:

| Alana Bloom: | "I was wrong about you" |
| Will Graham: | "Because you didn't believe me? Or in me? Because you let me question my sanity? My sense of reality?" |

Alana Bloom:	"Because you tried to kill Hannibal. You're wrong about him, Will"
Will Graham:	"No, you're wrong about him, Alana. You see the best in him, I… don't"
Alana Bloom:	"What was done to you doesn't excuse what you did. Are you going to try to hurt Hannibal again? Is he safe?"
Will Graham:	"From me or for you? He's dangerous, Alana. I suggest you stay as far away from Hannibal Lecter as you can"

(Hannibal, S02E07, 00:16:00-00:17:38)

In this conversation, Will points out that her kindness makes her a victim of Hannibal's charm and seductive traits. Will further emphasises when he states that she refuses to listen to his warnings, and only sees the best in Hannibal. As a result of Hannibal's manipulation and the fact that Will cannot easily be categorised and seem abject, she believes Will is the monster of the two and does not listen to his warnings. Her kindness and naïve attitude therefore makes her an easy prey for Hannibal, who in the end tries to kill her by manipulating Abigail to push her out of a window.

The problem of protecting women is an issue that is present in *Hannibal*, just as it is in *The Fall*. In both TV-series the institutions within society that are supposed to protect women, such as the police, frequently fails at their job. The most obvious example is that Hannibal is recruited as an FBI consultant, and that no one are able to detect his abnormality. This is especially frightening, as the FBI are supposed to be expert at hunting down abnormal, monstrous persons like him.

As discussed earlier, Jack is a frequent guest at Hannibal's dinner table, and has as a result been a victim of his cannibalistic behaviour. The fact that even Jack is manipulated by his seductiveness is frightening for us as viewers, as he is supposed to be one of the experts on detecting abnormal behaviour. We get to witness how the male monster easily manipulates the protectors within society, in a way that makes it unable for them to reveal him as a monster. Since narratives such as *The Fall* and *Hannibal* can be seen to function as cautionary tales in a way, this teaches us an important lesson about the dangers that lurks within contemporary society. The fact that not even Jack is able to reveal the monster that hides right next to him, implies that it is almost impossible for 'normal' persons to reveal the male monsters.

This is further emphasised when Jack believes Hannibal when the latter frames Will as the 'Chesapeake Ripper'. The judicial system in Western society is highly dependent on physical evidence in order to convict individuals for criminal actions. Hannibal takes advantage of this when he plants evidence that lead Jack and the FBI towards Will. Hannibal's ability to manipulate the judicial practices is addressed as Jack visits Will when he is imprisoned on suspicion of murder:

Will Graham:	"He did it so well. And there… There wasn't an orgy of evidence, there were just enough to convince you"
Jack Crawford:	"We investigated your claims about Dr Lecter, Will. Thoroughly. We ran over every fibre of every stich of clothing. We took his DNA, we took his fingerprints. We found nothing"
Will Graham:	"You let the fox into the hen house"
Jack Crawford:	"You stood over Cassie Boyle's body in that field and you described yourself to me"
Will Graham:	"No, I described Hannibal Lecter"
Jack Crawford:	"I can't hear this anymore"
Will Graham:	"I am not the intelligent psychopath you are looking for"
Jack Crawford:	"Goodbye Will"
Will Graham:	"You may not believe me now… you will"

(Hannibal, S02E01, 00:38:21-00:39:19)

Hannibal is so good at hiding his traces that he even fools the very institution that is supposed to hunt down monsters like him. The fact that he is as intelligent as he is, and educated within the field of medicine, provides him with the knowledge he needs in order to make Will look like the 'intelligent psychopath' the FBI are looking for. Cohen (1996) argues that one of the core traits of the monster is its ability to crumble 'scientific inquiry and its ordered rationality' (Cohen 1996:7). This is exactly what Hannibal does when he plants evidence that leads the FBI to Will, rather than him, and it shows how the moral monster is not only capable of manipulating individuals, but also the judicial system upon which society is built.

As mentioned earlier, Foucault argued that there has been a shift in the judicial system that made it more pathologised, and consequently made it shift focus from the crime to the mental state of the criminal. To assess the mental state of an individual is also a tool that can

be used when trying to categorise abnormal individuals, and this is addressed in *Hannibal*. One of the times this is mentioned in the series is when Frederick Chilton, the psychiatrist who treats Will when he is imprisoned, is questioned by the prosecutor in Will's trial. When the prosecutor asks him whether Will is an intelligent psychopath, he states 'is not yet a name for whatever Will Graham is' (Hannibal, S02E03, 00:22:45-00:22:49). This also implies that Will is an individual that is difficult to categorise, and that he deviates from what is considered 'normal'.

Another time the subject of categorisation is addressed is when Will's mental state is discussed in relation to the trial against him. Jack suggests that the reason why they try to define him as mentally ill is because he is difficult to categorise:

Jack Crawford: "Mental illness… Is it really mental illness, Doctor, or is it just that his mind works so differently from most people's that we don't know what else to call it?"

(Hannibal S01E12, 00:16:10-00:16:18)

Jack points out an interesting aspect when he questions whether Will really is mentally ill. He suggests that Will is categorised as insane merely because society lacks another definition for his abnormality. This indicates that the way society tries to group its members does not function the way it wants it to. It further suggests that the individuals who are different in a way, but do not transgress any borders, are still considered abject and abnormal. When something is perceived as abject, we feel a need to explain it and assert it into a category to make it less threatening. This is perhaps what happens to Will when he is asserted to the group of the mentally ill. We fear what we cannot explain, and a way of resolving this is to label the fearful idea or individual.

Warner (1998) states that 'one of the chief moral problems revealed by the fantasies of fear is that they search for a guilty party' and that the concerns about both real and imaginary dangers ''converts into diagnosis of moral evil' (Warner 1998:382). This is also the reason why we have an institution like the police that ensures that the laws of society is being followed, and hunts down those who do not conform to the rules. Since Will is an individual with traits that are considered slightly abnormal, it is easier for the FBI and society in general to suspect him of actions that also are considered abnormal, or transgressive. This indicates

how difficult it is to separate those individuals who are simply abnormal from those who are truly monstrous.

Will can perhaps be compared to one of the main characters in *The Fall,* Stella Gibson. They both function as 'huntsmen' who are on the hunt for the modern wolf, that is, the male serial killer. Another interesting feature that links these two characters is the fact that they are both categorised as 'abnormal' by society. As we have seen, Stella's sexuality is considered transgressive as it breaks with the gender stereotypes of Western society. According to Cohen (1996), '[t]he woman who oversteps the boundaries of her gender role' risks being categorised as a monster, since '"Deviant" sexual identity is […] susceptible to monserization' (Cohen 1996:9).

Will, on the other hand, has psychological traits and abilities that make him transgressive in the way that he cannot easily be categorised. As mentioned previously, Cohen (1996) claims that one of the core traits of the monster is the fact that it cannot easily be categorised, and that it threatens to destroy the distinctions society use to make boundaries (Cohen 1996:6). Since this refusal of categorisation also applies to Will, his surroundings begin to perceive him as a monster, even though he has worked for 'the good side' to secure that those who transgress the borders get caught. Both Stella and Will are therefore victims of the strict rules of society, in the way that they embody traits that are considered abnormal, which leads them to perform actions that society sees as transgressive. They both appear to be abnormal, but are in fact more normal than the male serial killers in the series, who are not suspected of being transgressive at all.

Will's position as a sort of victim becomes evident when Jack is discussing Will with his boss, Kate Purnell, and she states that 'it's easier to be man who missed his friend suffering, than it is to be the head of Behavioural Sciences at the FBI who missed a killer, standing right in front of him' (Hannibal, S02E03, 00:05:24-00:05:35). The irony of this comment is that while the FBI suspect Will, who is in fact innocent, the real killer is still hidden among them. This lack of ability to detect the monsters who walks among us can therefore be considered as one of the things that produces fear and anxiety within contemporary Western society.

Cannibalistic serial killings such as the ones presented in *Hannibal* also produce fear, and thereby there is a need to find the person responsible for the monstrous actions. When presented with one individual that shows abnormal traits and another, apparently normal and respected individual, the natural response would be to suspect the abnormal person. This makes it easier for Hannibal to frame Will and manipulate the FBI, since the former has an

outward appearance that seems to be normal, whereas the latter is a more ambiguous character.

The fact that not even the police are able to separate the 'good' people from the 'bad', signals that they are not always able to protect the members of society from monsters who threaten their safety. This suggests that in the end, we are all responsible for our own safety. This is particularly important for the young women to be aware of, as they are the most likely targets of the moral monster that lurks within society. They will have to be particularly aware of the threats towards their safety, and be suspicious of everyone, as everyone might be a potential threat. If the huntsmen are not able to detect the manipulative wolves in the forest, they will not be able to protect all the Red Riding Hoods.

In the previous chapter the story of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde was discussed in regards to Paul Spector's double self and how he was able to hide his abnormal traits, just like Dr Jekyll. This can be linked to Hannibal as well. Just like Dr Jekyll, Hannibal has also got a respected professor as a psychiatrist, which makes the people around him admire him. Another aspect that clearly links all three characters of Dr Jekyll, Paul Spector and Hannibal Lector is the fact that they have a double self, a part of themselves that they hide.

As discussed in regards to Paul, the reason to why people have to hide certain traits of their persona is because the rules of society are so strict, that certain things need to be hidden in order for individuals to stay within the borders of society. Whereas Paul needs to hide his murderous actions towards women, Hannibal has even more he needs to hide in order to be considered a 'normal' member of society. In Hannibal's case, this includes both his monstrous acts of killing as well as his cannibalistic behaviour. His intelligence enables him to have an occupation that is seen as respected, and this makes it easier for him to deceive the people around him.

However, there are some persons who manage to detect his double self, and one of them is Hannibal's psychiatrist Dr Bedelia Du Maurier. She explains how she has begun to 'question his actions' and suspects Hannibal of having a 'very well tailored person suit' or a 'human veil' which he wears in order to prevent others from detecting his abnormal persona (Hannibal S02E02, 00:08:04, S01E07, 00:16:38, S01E07, 00:17:01). When Hannibal argues that he is 'as honest as anyone' with her, she explains how she feels she has conversations with 'a version' of him (Hannibal S01E07 00:16:18). Eventually, she reaches the conclusion that he has a double self that is threatening towards the people around him:

<blockquote>
Bedelia Du Maurier: "I've had to draw a conclusion based on what I've glimpsed through the stitching of the person suit that you wear. And the conclusion that I've drawn is that you are dangerous"

(Hannibal S01E07, 00:08:35-00:08:52)
</blockquote>

This suggests that Bedelia believes that Hannibal in fact does have a double self that he uses in order to protect himself. What is interesting in regards to this is the fact that she has knowledge about him, but do not warn the others sufficiently for them to see who he really is. It could be argued that she is also complicit in his monstrous behaviour, since she knows that he is an individual who transgresses the normative and judicial borders of society, but does not do anything about it.

Throughout the series, one gets to know how Bedelia is also a victim of Hannibal's seductiveness. She was at one point attacked by one of her patients, and ended up killing him. What is special about this murder is Hannibal's role in it. When she discusses the event with Will, she explains how Hannibal persuaded her to kill her attacker, not just hurt him in self-defence:

<blockquote>
Bedelia Du Maurier: "I killed him. I believed it was self-defence. And to a point it was. But beyond that point, it was murder. Hannibal influenced me to murder my patient. Our patient"

Will Graham: "You weren't coerced?"

Bedelia Du Maurier: "What Hannibal does is not coercion. It is persuasion. Has he ever tried to persuade you to kill anybody? He will. And it will be somebody you love. And you will think it's the only choice you have"

(Hannibal S02E12, 00:13:50-00:15:08)
</blockquote>

Here, she describes how Hannibal's vampire-like traits have surfaced. Just like the vampire, Hannibal cannot use his persuasive powers unless he is invited to do so. It appears that he is able to involve other in his monstrousness merely by being close to them, and Bedelia is a victim of this. She explains how his seductiveness is so great that he is even able to make other people commit murder simply because he wants them to. By having a double self that

gives him an authoritative role and enables him to involve others in his abnormal behaviour, he becomes an extreme threat towards others.

Another character who is suspected of having a double self, is Will Graham. When he starts to suspect Hannibal of being the 'Chesapeake Ripper', the latter frames him as 'the Ripper' instead. Because Hannibal is a highly regarded, extremely manipulative person he is able to convince every one else. Will's unusual ability to emphasise with serial killers makes it even easier for Hannibal to frame him, since he proves difficult to categorise. The need for categorisation is significant in the Western society, as it provides us with a tool in order to know who is normal and who is not. It is done in order to determine who we need to protect ourselves against.

The fact that Will proves to be willing to transgress several normative and judicial rules in order to catch Hannibal and the other serial killers makes him a person who is problematic to categorise. As a result of this, he instantly becomes uncanny. He shows traits that are familiar, but there is also something about him that seems strange. His abnormal features are similar to the ones of the monster and, as mentioned earlier, Walton (2004) stated that the monstrous cannibal is '*the* signifier of both familiarity and strangeness' (Walton 2004:152). This similarity provides the people who surround him with a reason to suspect him of being a monster. As we have seen, this causes them to believe Will is the 'Chesapeake Ripper' when Hannibal starts to frame him for the murders he has committed.

It can be argued that Will is the series' most abnormal individual, except from Hannibal, and this is addressed the very first time Jack seeks Will's help in a murder case:

Jack Crawford:	"Where do you fall on the spectrum?"
Will Graham:	"My horse is hitched to a post that is closer to Asperger's and autistics than… narcissists and sociopaths"
Jack Crawford:	"But you can empathise with narcissists and sociopaths?"
Will Graham:	"I can empathise with anybody. It's less to do with a personality disorder than an active imagination"

(Hannibal, S01E01, 00:05:08-00:05:31)

Will's most apparent abnormality is connected to his unique ability to empathise with others, a trait that enables him to see things 'through the eyes of the killer'. This ability makes him a valuable asset for the FBI, as he manages to reconstruct the chain of thoughts of the monsters

they are trying to hunt down. On the other hand, this skill also proves to be problematic for him, as it makes many people doubt his intentions. One of the reasons to this is that Will is difficult to categorise, and Jack points this out when he states: 'we can't define Will, at all' (Hannibal, S02E01, 00:06:03). Once again, this points to how he is an individual who cannot easily be put into the strict groupings into which the Western society prefer to put its members.

This strangeness is perhaps also what causes Hannibal to gain an interest in Will. It even makes him believe that they could develop a friendship. Hannibal describes his fascination in regards to Will to his psychiatrist, Bedelia Du Maurier at one point:

Hannibal Lecter:	"For the first time in a long while, I see a possibility of friendship"
Bedelia Du Maurier:	"Is there someone new in your life?"
Hannibal Lecter:	"I met a man much like myself. Same hobbies, same worldviews, but I'm not interested in being his friend. I'm curious about him, and that got me curious about friendship"
Bedelia Du Maurier:	"Whose friendship are you considering?"
Hannibal Lecter:	"Oddly enough, a colleague and a patient, not unlike how I'm a colleague and a patient of yours. We've discussed him before"
Bedelia Du Maurier:	"Will Graham"
Hannibal Lecter:	"He's nothing like me. We see the world in different ways yet he can assume my point of view"
Bedelia Du Maurier:	"By profiling the criminally insane"
Hannibal Lecter:	"As good an demonstration as any. I find it reassuring"

(Hannibal, S01E08, 00:26:30-00:27:21)

Whereas Hannibal states that Will is nothing like him, he still acknowledges that they share many traits. According to Hannibal, Will is able to understand him in a way that not many people do. Even though he admits that there are differences between them, there is also a similarity that fascinates him. When Will's abnormality is so far out on the continuum that even a cannibalistic serial killer recognises that they share some traits, it is not difficult to understand how 'normal' individuals question Will's intentions. This produces fear within the other members of society, since they are not able to detect what kind of person he really is.

Everything and everyone who cannot be categorised can be seen as a potential threat towards society, since it contains an ambiguous feature. We have seen that the feeling of abjection arises when we are unable to set clear boundaries, and this produces fear and horror. We try to avoid these feelings by creating rules, and this is also what holds society together. This consequently means that whenever a person do not follow these or refuses to be categorised, they become abject and threatening. This fear of the unknown and ambiguous is perhaps also one of the reasons to why we still have cautionary tales. As mentioned earlier, these are supposed to show us what we are to fear within society, and what we need to watch out for.

Alana suggests that Will's great ability to imagine the scenarios that have taken place at murder scenes is a result of fear. As mentioned earlier, Warner argues that fantasies of fear always look for a guilty party, and this is perhaps one of Will's main motifs for helping the FBI. While discussing Will with Jack, she points this out:

Alana Bloom:	"Normally I wouldn't even broach this, but what do you think one of Will's strongest drives is?"
Jack Crawford:	"Fear?"
Alana Bloom:	"Mm-hmm"
Jack Crawford:	"Will Graham deals with huge amounts of fear. Comes with his imagination"
Alana Bloom:	"It's the price of imagination"

(Hannibal, S01E01, 00:18:33-00:19:15)

The link between fear and imagination is interesting, as it can be connected to the function of cautionary tales in the Western society. The ability to imagine the threats that exist within the borders of society is crucial in order for these to function the way they are supposed to. Fear of the modern male monster is what these narratives are supposed to convey, in order to encourage the recipients to take the proper precautions.

We fear the moral monster because the cautionary tales have explained to us that they exist within the boundaries of society. Through our imagination we are able to predict what might happen if we encounter these, and narratives such as the cautionary tales emphasise these fantasies. The reason why texts such as *Hannibal* are able to produce fear within us is perhaps because they show us that there are real monsters, such as the cannibal, who exist

within society. It also shows us that these transgressive persons are able to hide because they have a double self that conceals their abnormalities in a very effective way.

Additionally, the series presents us with characters that appear to be monstrous, but cannot easily be categorised, which makes room for mistakes. The fact that we might categorise an 'innocent' person as 'guilty' or monstrous is frightening. It shows us that the strategies we use in order to protect ourselves within society might not function as well as we presume, and that monsters are able to transgress the boundaries set by society without anyone detecting it.

Since *Hannibal* presents us with at warning of the real monsters within society, it can perhaps be argued that the series is a monster itself. As we have seen, the word monster means warning, and the series could be said to also warn us about the aspects of society that can be dangerous for us as individuals, such as being categorised as monstrous by mistake. When the series manipulates us to view Hannibal's monstrous actions, it also makes us complicit. This means that the series can perhaps be seen as yet another kind of monster.

4.6 Conclusion

As we have seen, both *The Fall* and *Hannibal* present us with a serial killer who manages to conceal his abnormal traits from the rest of the world. Since monsters in literature function as devices to address anxieties within the culture, they can be said to exemplify the fear contemporary Western society has towards the individual who refuses to be categorised. It sheds light on the problem of detecting who is merely abnormal, and who is monstrous.

What narratives such as *Hannibal* show us is that the people we consider to be the best members of society might in fact turn out to be the very worst. Just like the main character in *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, Hannibal has a hidden, monstrous persona that he is able to conceal from the people he surrounds himself with. Through his cannibalistic behaviour he performs transgressive actions that makes him monstrous. He even transgresses the borders further by including others in these actions without their knowledge.

As mentioned, knowledge is important and can determine whether an action is monstrous or not. In the series this is linked to anthropophagy, in the sense that eating human flesh is not considered a monstrous act if the people who perform it are not aware that this is what they are eating. Since Hannibal has knowledge about where the meat comes from, and still includes other in the meals, it can be argued that his behaviour is even more monstrous.

The viewers of the series also share this knowledge, and it can therefor be argued that this make us complicit and thereby monstrous.

What makes Hannibal such a fascinating character is his the fact that he is uncanny. As we have seen, the uncanny represents those aspects of society that fundamentally disturbs our definitions, as well as our thought and feelings. It poses a threat towards what we perceive as familiar, and this is exactly what Hannibal does by having a normal outward appearance, while committing abnormal actions. This doubleness also makes him an abhuman, which means that he is an individual who enables to frighten us. However, the abhuman individual is alluring as well, and this trait makes him fascinating. This is the case with Hannibal, who is capable of seducing not only the people around him, but also us viewers. His alluring traits make his monstrousness even more dangerous, as these draws people towards him and make it possible for him to involve others in his monstrous behaviour.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

> Fiction is the lie that tells the truth
> > (Gaiman 2013)

> Monsters are meaning machines
> > (Halberstam 2003:131)

This thesis has addressed two contemporary texts and questioned whether they can be seen as modern forms of cautionary tales. By analysing how the modern moral monster, the serial killer, functions and is presented in the respective narratives, I have displayed how this can be seen as a warning of the threats that exist within modern Western society.

The monster is a notion that has been used in cautionary tales for centuries, and has remained popular because of its ability to evolve and adapt to the changes within society. Narratives such as myths, fairy tales and cautionary tales have been used as a device in order to pose structure and boundaries within society. One of the ways they are able to do this, is by defining who we view as 'other' or 'abhuman'. This helps us create binary oppositions that enable us to create a sense of self, as well as teaches us who (or what?) not to become. The monsters these narratives contain function as warnings of what might happen, or one might become, if one transgresses the rules.

As we have seen, Foucault argues that there has been a shift in how the monster has been perceived and recognised. Previously, one used physical traits in order to reveal the monsters that existed within society, but now it is instead detected through its behaviour and is described as a moral monster. This means that it has become 'invisible' in a way, and is perceived as a 'normal' individual and is as a result capable of hiding in plain sight.

The moral monster can be seen as the ultimate other, as it embodies traits and shows behaviour which is perceived as abnormal. We have seen that Kearney argues that 'monsters are our *others* par excellence' and that we need them in order to know who we are and to determine what our concept of 'self' contains and what we need to exclude from this (Kearney, cited in Wright 2013:17). This thesis has, however, shown that this is problematic since the moral monster is capable of hiding its transgressive traits.

Through the examination of two contemporary monster narratives we have seen that the modern serial killer can function as a warning of the threats that exist within the Western culture. As mentioned earlier, Cohen (1994) argues that the monster is capable of embodying

the anxieties of a culture, and when it is portrayed through literature it can address them. He further claims that the monster is a result of several aspects of society and its structure, and that this is what makes it a particularly useful symbol of the fears that exist within a culture. The modern male monster that is present in *The Fall* and *Hannibal* can therefore be seen as a frightening notion that produces anxiety within contemporary Western society. The male serial killer, who preys on women as in *The Fall* or on other humans as in *Hannibal*, creates such an anxiety by being 'invisible', or 'hidden in plain sight'. This challenges the very core of society as it prevents easy categorisation of people, and thereby undermining the boundaries upon which it is structured.

The moral monster's ability to hide monstrous behaviour makes it an abhuman subject. As mentioned previously, Hurley (1996, 2002) describes the abhuman as someone who does not have a fully human identity. This is a character who looks like a normal person, but embodies traits and shows behaviour that are considered abnormal. This combination of features makes the abhuman subject both frightening and fascinating at the same time, and can be perceived as uncanny. We recognise and identify with some of its traits, while we fear other. This makes the moral monster come across as what one of the characters in *The Fall* describes as 'a strange allure' (The Fall, S02E06). Its capability of fascinating us makes us continue to seek and read stories about it, and this enables the moral monster to continue its quest to give meaning to, and address, problematic concepts within society.

The modern, male monster in the two texts has shown us that the monster is in fact able to address and embody uncertainties that exist within society. Through its behaviour and traits it sheds light on the problematic aspects of society, which are difficult to address. The two text this thesis has analysed function as a 'modified' form of cautionary tales, since they warn us about how the strict boundaries, stereotypes and values of contemporary Western society makes us all monstrous. In the end, the modern cautionary tales might not only be warning us about dangerous individuals, but also society itself.

Another question this thesis has raised is whether the monster narratives can be seen as monstrous in themselves. The two texts that have been analysed in this thesis have shown how stories can involve their readers, or viewers, become complicit in the actions committed by the characters they include. By including us in the monstrous actions of the main characters, we also become monstrous in the way that we take part in and are fascinated by the monster narratives.

When writing this thesis, several fascinating topics emerged, which I did not have the opportunity to address properly due to time limitations. Further research within the field of

monster theory could shed more light on how the moral monster is presented in contemporary literature. This could lead to a greater understanding of how it challenges the borders of society, and our perception of ourselves. Also, by studying other monster narratives one could perhaps reveal how the moral monster is capable of commenting on other problematic aspects within Western society, which have not been addressed in this thesis. It could perhaps have been beneficial to look at other TV-series about serial killers, for instance *Dexter*, in order to see whether this challenges and questions other features of society. Nevertheless, I believe the two TV-series this thesis has analysed have been able to examine how the moral monster, the serial killer, challenges our society's rules and borders, to a certain extent.

I considered examining the link between the modern, moral monster and the Gothic genre in this thesis, as the monster is a figure that frequently inhabits such texts. The Gothic is a literary genre that focuses on portraying supernatural notions in order to produce fear and horror within the reader, and it could be relevant to investigate whether the chosen texts could be seen as a modern kind of Gothic narratives. In addition to this, it could be relevant to investigate even further how monster narratives can challenge gender roles, by looking at how these are presented in other, similar texts. Finally, it would be fascinating to look further into why narratives that evolve around human monsters have been so popular, and why they continue to hold a dominant role within contemporary Western culture.

This thesis has shed light on how we as a society try to create structure and balance by placing ambiguous and disturbing features in the body of the other, moral monster. This way, we are capable of addressing them, as well as distance ourselves from the troubling aspects of our culture and our identity. Even though this might seem as a useful strategy, it appears that we, through the creation of 'others', are more willing to deal with moral monsters rather than with ourselves. As this thesis and its moral monsters have tried to show, this strategy does not seem to resolve the problems that lie within contemporary Western society. The question we should rather ask ourselves is perhaps: maybe we should look less at our monsters, and more at ourselves?

Bibliography

Primary sources:

Cubitt, A. (Writer), & Verbruggen, J., (Director). (2013). "Insolence & Wine" [Television series episode]. In A. Cubbitt (Producer), *The Fall*. Belfast: Artists Studio/BBC Two. [5]

Cubitt, A. (Writer), & Verbruggen, J., (Director). (2013). "My Adventurous Song" [Television series episode]. In A. Cubbitt (Producer), *The Fall*. Belfast: Artists Studio/BBC Two.

Cubitt, A. (Writer), & Verbruggen, J., (Director). (2013). "The Vast Abyss" [Television series episode]. In A. Cubbitt (Producer), *The Fall*. Belfast: Artists Studio/BBC Two.

Cubitt, A. (Writer, director), & Verbruggen, J., (Director). (2014). "These Troublesome Disguises" [Television series episode]. In A. Cubbitt (Producer), *The Fall*. Belfast: Artists Studio/BBC Two.

Cubitt, A. (Writer, director), & Verbruggen, J., (Director). (2014). "What Is in Me Dark Illumine" [Television series episode]. In A. Cubbitt (Producer), *The Fall*. Belfast: Artists Studio/BBC Two.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2013). "Apéritif" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2013). "Œufs" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2013). "Coquilles" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2013). "Entrée" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2014). "Su-zakana" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International

---

[5] The names of the two series' episodes are collected from Netflix and imdb.com

Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2014). "Shiizakana" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Secondary sources:

Auerbach, N. (1995). *Our Vampires, Ourselves*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Auerbach, N., Skal, D. J. (1997). Preface. In N. Auberbach & D. J. Skal (Ed), *Dracula: A Norton Critical Editions*. London: W. W. Norton & Company.

Barthes, R. (1982). *Myth Today*. In Alexa Wright (2013). *Monstrosity – The Human Monster in Visual Culture* (25). London: I.B. Taurus & Co. Ltd.

BBC (2013). *The Fall: Launch Trailer – Original British Drama – BBC Two*. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tP5Tl04gv3g 25.02.16

Bennett, A., Royle, N. (Ed.) (2014). *An Introduction to Literature, Criticism and Theory* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.

Bettelheim, B. (1977). *The uses of enchantment: the meaning and importance of fairy tales*. New York, NY: Vintage books.

Botting, F. (2002). Aftergothic consumption, machines, and black holes. In Hogle, J. E (Ed.). (2002). *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction* (277-300). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, J. J. (1996). *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Cubitt, A. (Writer), & Verbruggen, J., (Director). (2013). "Dark Descent" [Television series episode]. In A. Cubbitt (Producer), *The Fall*. Belfast: Artists Studio/BBC Two.

Cubitt, A. (Writer), & Verbruggen, J., (Director). (2013). "Darkness Visible" [Television series episode]. In A. Cubbitt (Producer), *The Fall*. Belfast: Artists Studio/BBC Two.

Cubitt, A. (Writer, director), & Verbruggen, J., (Director). (2014). "Night Darkens the Street" [Television series episode]. In A. Cubbitt (Producer), *The Fall*. Belfast: Artists Studio/BBC Two.

Cubitt, A. (Writer, director), & Verbruggen, J., (Director). (2014). "Beauty Hath Strange Power" [Television series episode]. In A. Cubbitt (Producer), *The Fall*. Belfast: Artists Studio/BBC Two.

Cubitt, A. (Writer, director), & Verbruggen, J., (Director). (2014). "The Mind is its Own Place" [Television series episode]. In A. Cubbitt (Producer), *The Fall*. Belfast: Artists Studio/BBC Two.

Cubitt, A. (Writer, director), & Verbruggen, J., (Director). (2014). "The Perilous Edge of Battle" [Television series episode]. In A. Cubbitt (Producer), *The Fall*. Belfast: Artists Studio/BBC Two.

Crick, M. (1976). Explorations in Language and Meaning: Towards a Semantic Anthropology. In A. Wright (2013). *Monstrosity – The Human Monster in Visual Culture* (165). London: I.B. Taurus & Co. Ltd.

Foucault, M. (1975). *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1974-1975*. In V. Marchetti, Salomoni, A. and Burchell, G. (Eds). (2003). *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1974-1975*. London: Verso.

Freud, S. (1919). *The Uncanny* (130-155). In Morra, J., Smith, M (Ed.). (2006). *Visual Culture: Critical Concepts in Media and Cultural Studies. Volume II: Histories, Archeologies and Genealogies of Visual Culture*. London: Routledge.

Fryer, J. S. (2009). *Eating Animals*. New York, NY: Bac Bay Books/Little, Brown and Company.

Fryer, D. R. (2004). *The Intervention of the Other: ethical subjectivity in Levinas and Lacan*. New York, NY: Other Press LLC.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2013). "Amuse-bouche" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2013). "Potage" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2013). "Sorbet" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2013). "Fromage" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2013). "Trou Normand" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2013). "Buffet froid" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2013). "Rôti" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2013). "Relevés" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2013). "Savoureux" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2014). "Hassun" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2014). "Takiawase" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2014). "Mukozuke" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2014). "Futamono" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2014). "Yakimono" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2014). "Su-zakana" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2014). "Shiizakana" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J.,

Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2014). "Naka-Choco" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2014). "Ko No Mono" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2014). "Tome-wan" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Fuller, B. (Writer, director). (2014). "Mizumono" [Television series episode]. In Schuur, J., Trussell, C. D. (producers), *Hannibal*. Toronto: NBC, Gaumont International Television, Dino De Laurentiis Company, Living Dead Guy.

Gaiman, N. (2013, 15.10). Why our future depends on libraries, reading and daydreaming. Retrieved from: http://www.theguardian.com/books/2013/oct/15/neil-gaiman-future-libraries-reading-daydreaming 27.04.16

Halberstam, J. (2003). An Introduction to Gothic Monstrosity. In K. Linehan (Ed.) (2003) *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde – Robert Louis Stevenson* (128-131). New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Hurley, K. (2002). British Gothic Fiction, 1885-1930. In J. E. Hogle (Ed.) (2002) *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction* (189-208). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kavka, M. (2002). The Gothic on Screen. In J. E. Hogle (Ed.) (2002) *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction* (209-228). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kearney, R (2003). *Strangers, Gods and Monsters: Interpreting Otherness*. In A. Wright (2013). *Monstrosity – The Human Monster in Visual Culture* (17). London: I.B. Taurus & Co. Ltd.

Kristeva, J. (1982). *The Powers of Horror. An Essay on Abjection*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Lechte, J. (2003). *Key Contemporary Concepts. From Abjection to Zeno's Paradox* (10-11, 192-194). London: SAGE Publications.

Perrault, C. (1697). Little Red Riding Hood. In J. Zipes (Ed). (1993). *The Trials & Tribulations of Little Red Riding Hood* (91-93). London: Routledge.

Riquelme, J. P. (2014). Modernist Gothic. In J. E. Hogle (Ed.). (2014). *The Cambridge Companion to the Modern Gothic* (20-36). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Teverson, A. (2013). *Fairy Tale*. London: Routledge.

Walton, P. L. (2004). *Our Cannibals, Ourselves*. Illinois, IL: University of Illinois Press. Retrieved from http://site.ebrary.com/lib/hisbib/reader.action?docID=10603892 15.04.16

Warner, M. (1995). *From the Beast to the Blonde*. London: Vintage.

Warner, M. (1998). *No Go the Bogeyman*. London: Chatto & Windus.

Warner, M. (2010). Boys Will be Boys: The Making of the Male in *Managing monsters: Six Myths of Our Time. The 1994 Reith Lectures* (17-31). London: Vintage.

Wright, A. (2013). *Monstrosity – The Human Monster in Visual Culture*. London: I.B. Taurus & Co. Ltd.

Zipes, J. (Ed). (1993). *The Trials & Tribulations of Little Red Riding Hood*. London: Routledge.

Zipes, J. (2006). *Why Fairy Tales Stick*. London: Routledge.

Zipes, J. (2012). Who's Afraid of the Brother's Grimm? Socialization and Politicization Through Fairy Tales in *Fairy Tales and the Art of Subversion* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Tertiary sources:

Anthropophagy (2016). Oxford English Dictionaries online. Retrieved from http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/anthropophagy 05.05.16

Cannibalism (2016). Encyclopædia Britannica. Retrieved 04.04.16, from http://global.britannica.com/topic/cannibalism-human-behaviour 05.05.16

Cannibalism (2016). Oxford English Dictionaries online. Retrieved from http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/cannibalism 05.05.16

Innocent (2016). Oxford English Dictionaries online. Retrieved from http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/innocent 05.05.16

Liminal (2016). Oxford English Dictionaries online. Retrieved from http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/liminal 05.05.16

Misogyny (2016). Oxford English Dictionaries online. Retrieved from
http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/misogyny 05.05.16

Ontology (2016). Oxford English Dictionaries online. Retrieved from
http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/ontological 05.05.16

Other (2016). Oxford English Dictionaries online. Retrieved from
http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/other 05.05.16

Otherness (2016). Oxford English Dictionaries online. Retrieved from
http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/otherness 05.05.16

Slut shaming (2016). Oxford English Dictionaries online. Retrieved from
http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/slut-shaming?q=slut+shaming
05.05.16

Taboo (2016). Oxford English Dictionaries online. Retrieved from
http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/taboo 05.05.16